DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 592 PS 016 750

AUTHOR Anderson, Jeffrey; And Others
TITLE Applying Automation to Investigations of Child Abuse. Impact Evaluation Report on the Case Decision Project (September 1, 1984, to August 31, 1986).
INSTITUTION Texas State Dept. of Human Services, Austin.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Human Development Services (DHHS), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 8 Jun 87
GRANT OHDS-90-A-0974/01
NOTE 225p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Automation; *Child Abuse; *Computer Oriented Programs; *Computer Software; *Investigations; Models; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; State Programs; *Workbooks
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

Because increased need for child protective services exceeded the Texas Department of Human Services' capacity for timely response, a 2-year Case Decision Project was implemented with the aim of applying automation to parts of the case investigation process. The project produced a Case Investigation Decision Support System with two sections: a manual version and an automated version. The manual version consists of a workbook that leads users through a standardized method for obtaining case information and making case decisions. Although the workbook was designed to prepare users for the automated version, it can also be used by itself. In a pilot test, the workbook gained broad acceptance. Part I of this document gives a full report on the evaluation of the workbook, and discusses several problems which were identified by pilot testing of the automated version. Part II provides details on the evaluation of the automated version. Related materials, including questionnaires, model outlines, status reports, and design resources, are appended. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

INSIDE:
Quick Ref. Guide p. viii
Findings Summary p. ix–xi
Glossary—before back cover

ED286592

IMPACT EVALUATION REPORT

Case Decision Project

Grant No. 90CA0974/01

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Applying Automation to Investigations of Child Abuse

June 8, 1987

PS 016750

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jeffrey M. Anderson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Office of Strategic Management, Research, and Development

Texas Department of Human Services

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This project was funded by the Office of Human Development Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, in fulfillment of OHDS Grant No. 90A0974/01.

The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Office of Human Development Services of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Texas Department of Human Services

John H. Winters Human Services Center • 701 West 51st Street
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 2960 • Austin, Texas 78769

COMMISSIONER
MARLIN W. JOHNSTON

BOARD MEMBERS
[illegible]

June 15, 1987

Ms. Lois Hodge
Office of Human Development Services/HHS
Grants Management Division
Room 345-F, Hubert H. Humphrey Bldg.
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

RE: Case Decision Project
Grant No. 90CA09741/01

Dear Ms. Hodge:

Enclosed are three copies of the final Impact Evaluation Report on the Case Decision Project for the period September 30, 1984, through August 31, 1986. The authors and editor have tried to arrange this report to meet the information needs of different readers. I suggest that readers begin with--

- viii--quick reference guide; and
- ix-xi--summary of findings.

If you have any questions about the report please call Garry L. McDaniel, project specialist, Project Design and Support Section (512) 450-3644.

Thank you for your assistance in ensuring that Case Decision was a useful project.

Sincerely,

Alicia D Essary

Alicia Dimmick Essary, Administrator
Special Projects Division (234-E)
Office of Strategic Management,
Research, and Development

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Jerry Mabe

APPLYING AUTOMATION TO INVESTIGATIONS OF CHILD ABUSE

Impact Evaluation Report on the Case Decision Project

September 1, 1984, to August 31, 1986

Grant No. 90A0974/01

June 8, 1987

Prepared by

Jeffrey Anderson (Evaluator)
Ping Fang Chu (Evaluator)
Nicholas Constant (Information Specialist)
Garry McDaniel (Project Specialist)
David Sheets (Program Specialist)
John Theiss (Evaluator)

Submitted by
Texas Department of Human Services
Protective Services for Children Branch
James C. Marquart, Ph.D., Assistant Commissioner

and

Office of Strategic Management,
Research, and Development
Murray A. Newman, Ph.D., Associate Commissioner
P.O. Box 2960
Austin, Texas 78769
(512) 450-3011

CONTENTS

List of Figures and Tables (iv)

Preface (vi)

PART I--CIDSS WORKBOOK

Executive Summary (I-ii)

1. BACKGROUND (I-1)

1.1 Introduction (I-1)
1.2 CPS Automation Plan (I-4)
1.3 Developing the Workbook (I-7)

2. METHODS (I-13)

2.1 Introduction (I-13)
2.2 Population and Sample (I-13)
2.3 Evaluation Research Design (I-14)
2.4 Types of Data Analysis (I-16)

3. FINDINGS (I-17)

3.1 Introduction (I-18)
3.2 Attitudes toward Work and Standardization (I-19)
3.3 Evaluation of the Workbook (I-24)
3.4 Evaluation of Training (I-39)
3.5 Evaluation of the Pilot Test (I-52)
3.6 Summary of Overall Findings (I-62)

4. CONCLUSIONS (I-64)

PART II--CIDSS AUTOMATED SYSTEM

Executive Summary (II-ii)

1. BACKGROUND (II-1)

1.1 Introduction (II-1)
1.2 CPS Automation Plan (II-3)
1.3 Developing CIDSS (II-6)
1.4 Pilot Site Implementation (II-11)

2. METHODS (II-14)

2.1 Introduction (II-14)
2.2 Population and Sample (II-14)
2.3 Evaluation Research Design (II-15)

3. FINDINGS (II-18)

3.1 Introduction (II-18)
3.2 CPS Specialist and Supervisor Comments (II-18)
3.3 Training (II-19)

4. CONCLUSIONS (II-21)

APPENDIX

A. Evaluation Surveys (CIDSS Workbook Evaluation)

B. Implementation Factors Inventory (CIDSS Workbook Evaluation)

C. CPS Automated Systems

D. RIF/RAF Model

E. Material Used in Developing the Conceptual Design

F. Status Report on Automated CIDSS

G. Questionnaires for Evaluation of CIDSS Automated System

H. Implementation Factors Survey for Evaluation of Automated CIDSS

GLOSSARY

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure

I-1. Proposed Flow of CPS Automated Systems and Their Stages of Development (I-5)

I-2. RIF/RAF Model of CPS Case Investigations (I-12)

I-3. Pattern of Change in Supervisors' Views on the Workbook (I-57)

Table

I-1. Pilot Test Volunteers by DHS Region and Job (I-14)

I-2. Attitudes toward Job (I-21)

I-3. Attitudes toward Standardization and the Workbook (I-22)

I-4. Using the Workbook--Pro and Con (I-25)

I-5. Opinions on the Idea of Standardization (I-26)

I-6. CIDSS Workbook: Realization vs. Expectations (I-27)

I-7. Workbook's Effects on Documenting Case Investigation (I-29)

I-8. Type of Cases Workbook is Useful For (I-30)

I-9. When Respondents Use the Workbook (I-31)

I-10. Workbook's Effect on Case Documentation Time (I-32)

I-11. Workbook's Effect on Meeting Program Standards (I-33)

I-12. Workbook's Effect on Number of Contacts (I-34)

I-13. Trainee Scores for Entering Information into the Workbook (I-41)

I-14. Trainee Scores by Location of Training (I-41)

I-15. Trainee Scores by Position (I-42)

I-16. Scores for Matching Model Sections and Workbook Sections (I-43)

I-17. Trainees' Opinions of Instructors and Material (I-43)

I-18. Additional Information, Support, or Training Requested (I-46)

I-19. Self-Assessed Proficiency vs. Tested Proficiency with the Workbook (I-48)

I-20. Scores on Model Exercise vs. Attitudes toward Standardization and the Workbook (I-50)

I-21. Supervisors' Assessments of User and Setting Factors (I-55)

I-22. Supervisors' Assessments of Innovation Factors (I-56)

PREFACE

REASONS FOR THE PROJECT

In recent years the Texas Department of Human Services (DHS) has faced a rising need for child protective services (CPS) that exceeds the Department's capacity for timely response to all cases. In 1983, for example, the reported incidence of child abuse or neglect rose by almost 9 percent over 1982. To complicate the problem, this increase came at a time when the available resources were shrinking.

Shrinking resources and increasing caseloads have limited the time that workers can give each case and made it more difficult for them to make decisions efficiently, accurately, and consistently. As a result, families may not be offered appropriate services, inappropriate foster care placements can occur, and children sometimes have to wait longer for a decision about placement in an adoptive home.

To address these problems, DHS in September 1984 undertook the two-year Case Decision Project. Its goal was to improve productivity and impact in child protective services by applying automation to parts of the case investigation process.

WHAT THE PROJECT ACCOMPLISHED (AND WHAT REMAINS TO BE DONE)

The project produced a Case Investigation Decision Support System (CIDSS), which has two parts:

1. a manual version--a workbook that leads users through a standardized method for obtaining case information and making case decisions; and

2. an automated version.

Although the workbook (Appendix A) was intended as a "stepping stone" toward the automated version, it can be used by itself. In a pilot test, the workbook gained broad acceptance. Part I of this document gives a full report on evaluation of the workbook, and the "Main Findings and Conclusions" are summarized on page ix (one of the "yellow pages" at the end of this preface).

Pilot testing of the automated CIDSS discovered a number of problems. One aspect of the system seemed useful to pilot participants; the other, under present circumstances, did not prove feasible. Part II of this document gives details on evaluation of the automated CIDSS, and "Main Findings and Conclusions" are summarized on page x.

In R&D work the discovery of problems can be highly useful information. DHS staff are now at work refining the automated CIDSS with statewide implementation planned for 1988.

Applying automation to the process of investigating cases takes considerable time and effort. However, the potential benefits--among which are more uniform collection of information, more accurate decisions, and greater efficiency--appear to justify the costs. By sharing its experience through this report, the Department hopes to help others embarking on automation reap the benefits sooner than they might have otherwise--and at lower costs in time and effort.

SUGGESTIONS ON HOW TO USE THIS REPORT

Readers have differing information needs, and all are pressed for time. We (the authors and editor) have tried to arrange this report with you in mind. Generally, we suggest that you READ THE YELLOW PAGES first.

If you have...	You might first read ...
10-15 mins.	Main Findings and Conclusions (pp. ix-x) Other Lessons Learned (p. xi)
20-30 mins.	the preceding plus Part I Conclusions (I-64 to I-65) Part II Conclusions (II-21 to I-23)
30-45 mins.	the preceding plus Part I Summary of Findings (I-62 to I-63) Part II Findings (II-18 to II-20)
45-60 mins.	the preceding plus Part II "subsection directories" (pp. I-19, I-24, I-39, I-52)

To aid this type of "skim reading," a GLOSSARY (located just before the back cover) gives definitions of special terms and acronyms.

Although the evaluation was conducted by specialists with doctoral-level training, we have tried to make the entire report accessible to the general reader. Specialists in evaluation, systems analysis, or programming who want more details should contact David Sheets at the address on the title page.

MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

I: CIDSS WORKBOOK

Attitudes toward Standardization

The Case Decision Project produced the Case Investigation Decision Support System (CIDSS). The system has two parts: (I) a manual workbook and (II) an automated system. Each part was evaluated separately. (As a basis for developing CIDSS, the project also produced a conceptual model of the case investigation process.)

Evaluation of Workbook

A large majority of surveyed caseworkers and supervisors thought that a standardized method for gathering case information and making case decisions is a good idea. They would use the workbook of their own volition.

Conclusion. The workbook's standardized approach found general acceptance.

Evaluation of Training

Seventy percent of those surveyed thought the workbook better than previous methods of documenting cases. The consensus was that the workbook made it easier to meet program standards and did not add to the overall effort of investigating a case. Shortcomings cited--the workbook isn't well suited to documenting complex cases, and refinements are needed to better reflect the actual sequence of case investigation.

Conclusion. Project managers should study the benefits of suggested refinements.

Evaluation of Pilot Test

Trainees gave instructors and training material positive ratings, though they requested more definitions, examples, and follow-up sessions. Scores on exercises that tested understanding of the model and proficiency in using the workbook indicated a need for improvements in training.

An interesting finding was that those who scored highest on the exercises were likely to have reported positive attitudes toward the idea of standardization.

Conclusion. With more detailed training, written instructions for using the workbook, and follow-up sessions the workbook can and should be implemented statewide.

At the end of an eight-week pilot test, most staff had a higher opinion of the workbook than they did before the test.

Conclusion. The workbook is at least an acceptable and probably a good alternative to previous methods.

II. AUTOMATED CIDSS

The automated CIDSS was intended to handle information for two purposes:

1. to record case information and analyze it to aid in decisions on whether to open or close a case (DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM--DSS);

2. to receive and assign cases (intake), track their status, and produce information to aid management of the work (MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM--MIS).

Reactions to the Pilot Test

In the pilot test of the automated CIDSS, staff reported largely negative experience with the DSS aspect but fairly positive reaction to the MIS aspect. The latter offered some clear benefits for day-do-day operations, whereas the former seemed unhelpful.

Caseworkers' Comments

Caseworkers complained that the automated CIDSS was a slow and cumbersome way of recording case information compared to taped dictation. They also voiced a need for better training and follow-up, a user's guide to the software, and on-site consultation. They felt they needed a period of relief from their regular work load to learn the new system. And access to terminals at convenient times was a problem.

Supervisors' Comments

Supervisors agreed about the shortcomings of training. They also felt that data entry was not a good use of caseworkers' time. Supervisors still think that an automated system can prove helpful for assigning and managing cases.

Conclusions

Although CIDSS was not designed primarily as an MIS, pilot test staff found this aspect much more useful than the DSS aspect. CIDSS is being redesigned to provide a greater range of managment information. Project managers believe that experience with an MIS will prepare the ground for successful implementation of a DSS.

MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

I: CIDSS WORKBOOK

The Case Decision Project produced the Case Investigation Decision Support System (CIDSS). The system has two parts: (I) a manual workbook and (II) an automated system. Each part was evaluated separately. (As a basis for developing CIDSS, the project also produced a conceptual model of the case investigation process.)

Attitudes toward Standardization

A large majority of surveyed caseworkers and supervisors thought that a standardized method for gathering case information and making case decisions is a good idea. They would use the workbook of their own volition.

Conclusion. The workbook's standardized approach found general acceptance.

Evaluation of Workbook

Seventy percent of those surveyed thought the workbook better than previous methods of documenting cases. The consensus was that the workbook made it easier to meet program standards and did not add to the overall effort of investigating a case. Shortcomings cited--the workbook isn't well suited to documenting complex cases, and refinements are needed to better reflect the actual sequence of case investigation.

Conclusion. Project managers should study the benefits of suggested refinements.

Evaluation of Training

Trainees gave instructors and training material positive ratings, though they requested more definitions, examples, and follow-up sessions. Scores on exercises that tested understanding of the model and proficiency in using the workbook indicated a need for improvements in training.

An interesting finding was that those who scored highest on the exercises were likely to have reported positive attitudes toward the idea of standardization.

Conclusion. With more detailed training, written instructions for using the workbook, and follow-up sessions the workbook can and should be implemented statewide.

Evaluation of Pilot Test

At the end of an eight-week pilot test, most staff had a higher opinion of the workbook than they did before the test.

Conclusion. The workbook is at least an acceptable and probably a good alternative to previous methods.

PART I

Impact Evaluation

CASE INVESTIGATION DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM (CIDSS)

MANUAL WORKBOOK

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Protective Services for Families and Children (PSFC) Branch is developing automated support for child protective services (CPS) field staff. The case investigation workbook began as a recording instrument to support software intended to automate CPS case investigation reporting and recording. The workbook was a prototype of the software system and was used by CPS specialists to test the planned content and organization of the software. During prototyping, it became apparent that the workbook could stand on its own, and that it had advantages over current procedures for recording case investigations.

> The pilot test of the CIDSS workbook was intended to help refine the content and organization of the software and to test the usefulness of the workbook without software.

SOFTWARE IMPLICATIONS

The format of the workbook was generally acceptable. Staff did not suggest revisions that influence the content or organization of the software. Staff comments recommend a high level of training and support during workbook implementation. An implication of their comments is that--

> the workbook and the software should be implemented separately to minimize the likelihood of training overload. Results of the training evaluation are consistent with this conclusion.

WORKBOOK IMPLICATIONS

The pilot test staff had generally positive reactions to the workbook. Nearly two-thirds of them said that they would probably or definitely continue to use the workbook if it were their decision to make.

> Over three-quarters of the respondents agree with PSFC that the workbook is a good idea.

PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

A few problems were identified. The solutions to most of the problems consisted of better directions for using the workbook and more training, especially practice and examples. Frequently, training needs were specified as a "need for follow-up training." It is appropriate to conclude that--

> given (1) detailed training, (2) written directions on use of the workbook and (3) training follow-up at one to two months, the workbook can and should be implemented statewide.

1. BACKGROUND

As a convenience to the reader, sections (and some of the longer subsections) are preceded by a "mini" table of contents dubbed a "directory."

Section 1 Directory

1.1 Introduction (I-1)

1.2 CPS Automation Plan (I-4)

1.3 Developing the Workbook (I-7)

1.1 INTRODUCTION

CPS Automation Stages. The Protective Services for Families and Children (PSFC) Branch of the Texas Department of Human Services (DHS) is engaged in an effort to automate child protective services (CPS). This effort is being pursued in three stages.

- The first stage, providing automated support for the intake function, has been completed.
- The second stage, automated support for case investigations, has been pilot-tested and is currently being redesigned for statewide implementation.
- The third stage, automated support for planning and managing cases that are opened for services, is the most complex and sensitive of the three efforts and is still under development.

The Case Decision Project contributed to the second stage of CPS automation.

The Case Decision Project developed the Case Investigation Decision Support System (CIDSS), which consists of two parts:

1. The CIDSS manual workbook (Part I of this report describes its evaluation and reports on the support needed to facilitate introduction of the workbook as Texas' standard form for recording CPS investigations).

2. The CIDSS automated system, a software version of the workbook (Part II of this report describes its evaluation, reports on problems of introducing an automated system, and suggests some solutions).

The Case Investigation Decision Support System (CIDDS) manual workbook began as a recording instrument and guide to support software intended to automate CPS case investigation reporting and recording. The workbook was a paper representation of the software system. The software and the workbook were based on a model that increases objectivity by separating the investigation and decision-making aspects of the process (see subsection 1.3).

Goals for the Workbook. The workbook was treated as a prototype of the software system and used by case investigation specialists to test the planned content and organization of the software. During prototyping, it became apparent that the workbook could stand on its own and that it had advantages over current procedures for recording case investigations. The pilot test of the CIDSS workbook was intended to help refine the content and organization of the software and to test the usefulness of the workbook without software. The decision to test the feasibility of statewide implemen-

tation without software was made to see whether the workbook could help CPS achieve three goals:

- Standardize recording of case investigations. Use of the workbook provides a standardized format for recording and reporting the results of case investigations. Standardization facilitates communication and provides a basis for identifying the completeness and adequacy of the case record.

- Achieve standardization quickly. The automated system will take years to implement statewide, and it is likely that rural areas are many years away from access to networked automated record keeping.

- Separate learning investigation strategies from learning to use a computer. Using the workbook before using the software separates learning the standardized investigation system from learning to use the software and spreads the effort required over a longer period of time.

Early in the development of the automated system, versions of the workbook were used to prototype the form and content of the automated system. In July of 1985 the basic design of the software and thus the workbook had been established. Between August and November the workbook was refined, training designed, and the CIDSS workbook pilot test planned. The pilot test included nearly 100 CPS investigation specialists

from two DHS regions and ran for four months, November 1985 through February 1986.

1.2 CPS AUTOMATION PLAN

For the past several years human service agencies have found themselves in a situation of declining resources and expanding client service needs. One way to address this problem is to reduce the cost of service delivery and improve the effectiveness of services delivered. Computers have been successful in helping private industry reduce overhead and lower unit costs. DHS, like many other public agencies, has invested in automation in the hope of replicating private industry success. Figure 1-1 shows the proposed flow of CPS automation systems and indicates the stages completed so far.

Needs the System Must Meet. CPS's automation goals include development of an information system that meets a broad range of needs for three categories of staff.

1. Case Investigation Specialists: for the specialist in the field, needs include--
   - o a standardized format for recording;
   - o quick retrieval, revision, and transfer of case information;
   - o automated production and transmission of required forms;
   - o support in meeting program requirements;
   - o case decision support systems;
   - o work load and caseload status summaries; and

2. Supervisors: for the supervisor, system needs include--

Figure I-1. Proposed flow of CPS Automated Systems and their Stages of Development



I-5

- o more easily understood and interpreted records;
- o automated systems to facilitate work load management; and
- o unit work load and caseload status summaries

3. Regional and state staff: for regional and state program staff, system needs include--
   - o work load and performance summaries by program director, region, and branch;
   - o client population descriptions and tracking ability;
   - o management decision support; and
   - o policy testing (modeling) capability.

How CPS Automated Systems Aid Casework. In a local CPS office, the proposed CPS systems will perform three functions (also partially represented in the middle of figure I-1. The first function, Automated MAPPER[1] Intake (AMI), employs software to automate and provide printing and telecommunications capability for CPS intake. (The precursor to AMI was the Prompted Intake System.) Software to automate intake has been pilot tested and is currently in use by one intake site. As telecommunications and computer facilities become available, AMI will be implemented in additional sites.

The second function, the Case Investigation Decision Support System (CIDSS), has the following components:

1. the CIDSS workbook;
2. the automated CIDSS, which features--
   - o automated case recording,

---

[1]Maintaining, Preparing, and Producing Executive Reports--a UNISYS-developed software language.

- o automation of case management tasks, and
- o automated management information reporting.

The CIDSS Workbook has been pilot tested and is the subject of Part I in this evaluation report. Case recording software has been tested in the field. The decision support system is under development.

The third set of software functions, in the initial stage of design, will automate recording related to case management and planning.

1.3 DEVELOPING THE WORKBOOK

As a convenience to the reader, lengthier subsections such as this are provided with a directory.

Subsection 1.3 Directory

1.3.1 Introduction to CIDSS Development (I-7)

1.3.2 Specifying the Data Elements (I-8)

1.3.3 Developing the Model (I-9)

1.3.4 Finalizing the Instrument (I-11)

1.3.1 Introduction to CIDSS Development

At the beginning of the project the essential tasks were the following:

- o specify the data elements that need to be collected during an investigation in order to arrive at a sound decision about case disposition;

- develop a model of the decision-making process; and
- incorporate these two factors into an instrument that allows for ease of data collection by the worker and ease of case reading by the supervisor.

1.3.2 Specifying the Data Elements

The first step was to design a manual investigation workbook. This workbook was submitted to a process of review and modification by a work group made up of CPS experts from across the state. The group included field staff, CPS supervisors and administrators, and project managers. This combination of experience and perspectives ensured that the initial versions of the workbook were based on field experience, management analyses, and an extensive review of the clinical and research literature. After producing three revisions of the workbook, the group felt that no further development could take place without testing in actual work settings.

As a second step, the work group elected to carry out limited and informal field tests of the draft CIDSS workbook. A field-ready version of the workbook was produced, and three sites in Texas volunteered to test it for 60 days. Staff expected to use the workbook received an overview of its purpose and origin. They used the workbook for 30 days, and their recommendations for modification were used for revisions. The revised workbook was then introduced to the same sites, and after 30 to 45 days of use the staff's reactions and recommendations were solicited and used in revising the workbook again.

The testing and revision resulted in the pilot test version of the CIDSS workbook. The process also led to identification and specification of the CPS investigation decision-making process. Understanding the decision-making process allowed project managers to develop a model of the process and to design training for pilot test staff.

1.3.3 Developing the Model

As the workbook was being field tested, project managers were working on specifying training needs for a pilot test. A key element of developing clear and effective training was specification of a decision model, consistent with CPS literature, that could be applied in the field. A review of the literature indicated that the investigation consists of two separate decision processes: (1) assessing potential risk to the child and (2) assessing the capacity of the family and other resources to address the abuse situation.

Assessing risk included activities related to judging whether child abuse had occurred and the likelihood of future abuse. If investigators found that abuse was likely to occur in the future they proceeded to the second process, an assessment of what types of intervention would alter the abusive circumstances to minimize risk of future abuse.

Throughout the field tests, staff were asked to describe their use of and reactions to the workbook. Their reactions supported the separation of the decision processes but indicated that frequently the processes overlapped or were carried out simultaneously. The consistency among findings from the literature

review and interviews with field staff led project staff to accept the separation of decision processes and base the investigation model on this feature of investigations.

Feedback from staff and the opinions of the work group had resulted in a workbook with sections that addressed elements of each decision process. Analysis of the workbook sections and staff reports of how they used each section and subsection helped identify the activities included in the two investigation processes. The activities and processes were identified as falling into two stages.

Stage 1: Assessing Risk. Data from three general areas are collected and analyzed to determine the intensity of risk for abuse/neglect to the child.

- The Event: Did the alleged abuse/neglect occur?
- The Effect: How severe was the abuse/neglect, and what were its effects upon the child and family?
- The Environment: To what extent does the psychosocial and physical environment act to support or prevent the occurrence of abuse/neglect?

If some degree of risk intensity is found, Stage 2 of the model is invoked.

Stage 2: Assessing Available Intervention/Treatment Resources. Resources available to reduce the risk intensity are assessed in order to arrive at one of two case decisions: (1) close the case, or (2) open the case for in-home services or removal of the child from the home. Three types of resources are assessed.

- o The Family: Does the nuclear and/or extended family have sufficient resources to reduce the risk intensity? If so the case can be closed.

- o The Community: Are community resources available and accessible to the family to reduce the risk intensity? If so, the case can be closed after appropriate referrals are made.

- o Child Protective Services: If the child is still at risk after the application of family and community resources, the family is eligible for child protective services. The level of risk at this point will determine the level of intervention (in-home services or removing the child).

The model based on this analysis of the investigation process is called the RIF-RAF Model (Risk Intensity Factors/Resource Availability Factors). Figure I-2 attempts to present it visually.

1.3.4 Finalizing the Instrument

The workbook was introducted to a new site with training. Input from staff at the new site was presented at the next work group meeting. During the meeting another revision of the workbook was produced. At this meeting the work group decided that the workbook was close to its final form, that the training plan was adequate, and that a formal pilot test of the workbook should be carried out. Evaluation up to this point had been informal, and it was felt that a more reliable evaluation was needed to provide a solid

foundation for a system of this importance and complexity.

Figure I-2. RIF/FAF Model of CPS Case Investigations



The RIF/RAF Model (and the analysis from which it came) provided the basis for training the pilot test staff.

2. METHODS

Section 2 Directory

2.1 Introduction (p. I-13)

2.2 Population and Sample (p. I-13)

2.3 Evaluation Research Design (p. I-14)

2.4 Types of Data Analysis (p. I-16)

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The methods section includes three subsections. First, the population and sample are discussed in terms of their adequacy to answer the research questions. Second, the research design and the research questions are discussed. Third, the data analyses are introduced. (The resulting findings are presented in section 3.)

2.2 POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The work group for the pilot wanted to ensure that the workbook was tested with all types of cases as well as in both urban and rural settings. With these criteria expressed, two regions volunteered as pilot sites: Region 11 (Houston) and Region 8 (Corpus Christi and the Rio Grande Valley). These sites met the selection criteria and were chosen for the pilot. Participation within each region was also voluntary, and 117 staff volunteered to test the workbook. Table I-1 shows the breakdown of specialist and supervisor staff by region.

TABLE I-1
Pilot Test Volunteers by DHS Region and Job

Staff Position	Region 8	Region 11
Program Directors	3	3
Unit Supervisors	12	3
Case Specialists	71	25
Total	86	31

The voluntary nature of selection may be a bias in the sample. However, volunteering was done at a management level, and individual workers were required to participate if their supervisors opted to do so. Also, nearly all staff managed by the six project directors used the workbook.

2.3 EVALUATION RESEARCH DESIGN

2.3.1 Evaluation Questions

The CIDSS workbook pilot test was designed to answer the following general evaluation questions:

- How do workers respond to use of the workbook?
- What are the problems with the layout or content of the workbook?
- What types of training and support are necessary to support introduction and use of the workbook?

The evaluation also set out to identify what implications the workbook evaluation might have for the content and organization of the CIDSS software.

2.3.2 Evaluation Strategies

The evaluation plan included three strategies to answer these questions: (1) questionnaires, (2) telephone contacts, and (3) individual and group discussions.

Questionnaires. There were two types of questionnaires.

- One type, administered to both case investigation specialists and to supervisors, was a series of attitude surveys (Appendix A). These surveys asked staff about their experience with the workbook, their reactions to standardization of case investigation record keeping, and their opinion on aspects of the workbook and their job. The attitude questionnaires were administered before the pilot test, after staff training, and at the end of the pilot. The questionnaire administered after training included both open- and closed-ended questions evaluating the training.

The other type of questionnaire was the Implementation Factors (IF) Survey (Appendix B). This survey is a simple procedure for anticipating implementation problems and monitoring problem resolution. Supervisors and program directors in the pilot sites completed IF surveys before, during, and at the end of the pilot.

Telephone Contacts. The second evaluation strategy was a telephone contact system that allowed each worker quick access to problem resolution. The system was set up to help identify workbook problems quickly and to provide a means of responding as quickly as possible

not only to the case investigation specialist who identified the problem but to all pilot test participants. Those with workbook problems had the option of contacting the project manager directly or contacting their supervisor to relay a problem to the project manager, who responded directly to the caller identifying a problem. The project manager then had the option of using a telephone tree or a memo (depending on the urgency of the problem) to report the resolution of the problem to pilot test staff.

Individual and Group Discussions. The third evaluation strategy consisted of informal contacts and group discussions organized around complaints and problems. Several of these contacts and discussions were carried out before the pilot test began. DHS travel restrictions and the small number of problems that came up meant there were few informal contacts and only two discussions with groups of staff during the pilot.

2.4 TYPES OF DATA ANALYSIS

The data analyses include frequency, breakdowns, and crosstabulations. Frequencies are used to display response rates by response category. Breakdown analyses are used to show mean responses across respondents. Crosstabulations are used to indicate associations among responses to different questions.

3. FINDINGS

Section Directory

3.1 Introduction (I-18)

3.2 Attitudes toward Work and Standardization (I-19)

3.3 Evaluation of the Workbook (I-24)

3.4 Evaluation of Training (I-39)

3.5 Evaluation of the Pilot Test (I-52)

3.6 Summary of Overall Findings (I-62)

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The evaluation findings are organized into five subsections. Subsection 3.2, "Attitudes toward Work and Standardization," provides a baseline measure of participants' attitudes about their jobs and the work they do. The subsection also presents information concerning how they expect standardization will influence the way they carry out a case investigation.

Subsection 3.3, "Evaluation of the Workbook," presents findings concerning how attitudes toward standardization and opinions of the workbook changed over the course of the pilot. Findings are presented on strengths and weaknesses of the workbook. The last part of the subsection identifies pilot test staff suggestions for improving the workbook.

Subsection 3.4, "Evaluation of Training," includes the findings from two post-test exercises, workers' reactions to the instructor and the training content, and a critique of the training content. This subsection includes an analysis of the relationship of performance on the post-training exercises and responses to two types of workbook evaluation questions.

Subsection 3.5, "Evaluation of the Pilot Test," reports on findings from the Implementation Factors Questionnaire. The questionnaire tracked supervisors' assessments of the workbook and their opinions of pilot test operations over time.

Subsection 3.6 summarizes the main findings described in subsections 3.2 through 3.5.

3.2 ATTITUDES TOWARD WORK AND STANDARDIZATION

Subsection 3.2 Directory

3.2.1 Data Sources (I-20)

3.2.2 Attitudes toward Job--Generally Positive, Little Change (I-20)

3.2.3 Attitudes toward Standardization--Little Change Overall (I-21)

3.2.4 Summary--Attitudes Little Influenced (I-23)

3.2.1 DATA SOURCES

Pilot test staff were asked about eight aspects of their work, before and at the end of the pilot test. The questions before the pilot were asked before staff were introduced to the workbook. The questions were asked again at the end of the pilot to see whether use of the workbook had an influence on staff attitudes toward work. The question response scales ranged from "7" to "1" with "7" representing the most desirable attitudes toward work and "1" the least desirable.

3.2.2 Attitudes toward Job-- Generally Positive, Little Change

Examination of the average scores shows little change in attitudes from before the pilot to after using the workbook for four months (table I-2).

The questionnaire item read "Here are some words and phrases which can be used to describe how you see your job. For example, if you think your job is very 'boring' circle number 1, right next to the word 'boring.' If you think you job is very 'interesting,' circle number 7, right next to the word 'interesting.' If you think it is somewhere in between, circle a number between 1 and 7."

Staff reported generally positive attitudes toward the eight aspects of their jobs. The highest scores indicated that the pilot staff find their job "Interesting" (6.1) and "Worthwhile" (6.2). The lowest average score was 4.2 on the Hopeful vs. Discouraging scale at the end of the pilot. Since 4.0 is the midpoint of the scale, 4.2 indicates a slight tendency for staff to respond that they find their work "Hopeful."

TABLE I-2
Attitudes toward Job

Attitude Categories	Before Pilot	End of Pilot
Interesting vs. Boring	6.1	6.1
Enjoyable vs. Miserable	4.4	4.6
Worthwhile vs. Useless	6.2	6.2
Friendly vs. Lonely	4.3	4.7
Full vs. Empty	5.2	5.6
Hopeful vs. Discouraging	4.4	4.2
Rewarding vs. Disappointing	4.6	4.8
Brings out the best in me vs. doesn't give me a chance	4.8	4.8
Average	5.0	5.1

The average scores of 5.0 and 5.1 indicate that before and after the pilot test staff had good attitudes toward their jobs and the work they do.

3.2.3 Attitudes toward Standardization--Little Change Overall

There were 11 questions on staff opinions concerning standardization and the workbook. These questions were asked before the pilot, after training on how to use the workbook, and at the end of the pilot test. There was very little difference in staff opinions concerning the workbook at each of the three times. Their overall mean score changed from 4.4 before the pilot to 4.3 after training to 4.2 at the end of the pilot (table I-3).

TABLE I-3
Attitudes toward Standardization and the Workbook

Attitude Statements[1]	Before Pilot	After Training	After Pilot
1. Not increase my work load[2]	4.6	4.2	4.4
2. Increase freedom on job	3.7	3.5	3.4
3. Improve quality of work I produce	4.7	4.6	4.0
4. Not more difficult to meet deadline	4.8	4.5	4.7
5. Not make it difficult to do good job	5.2	5.0	5.0
6. Make work more challenging	3.8	4.0	3.5
7. Not make work more frustrating	4.6	4.4	4.3
8. Not decrease my discretion on job	4.2	4.4	4.7
9. Increase ability to get work done	4.6	4.3	4.3
10. Easier to keep up with work load	4.9	4.3	4.1
11. Make my job more interesting	4.1	3.9	3.6
Average	4.4	4.3	4.2

1. The introduction to the 11 statements read as follows: "We are interested in learning how the CIDSS investigation guide has changed your job and the work you do. A number of possible changes are listed below. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking the appropriate numbered box on the seven-point scale."

2. These questions were asked with six positive statements and five negative ones. For this table, "not" was added to the negative statements to make them positive, and scores for these questions were converted to provide comparable scores across statements.

Mean ratings for three of the statements (numbers 3, 8, and 10) show a notable change from before training to after training. The scores that dropped (statements 3 and 10) indicate that experience with the form did not meet staff expectations to "improve the quality of work" and for making it "easier to keep up with work load." The score that increased (statement 8) indicated that use of the workbook did not decrease specialists' and supervisors' "discretion on the job" as much as they had anticipated. The average scores from before the pilot, after training, and after the pilot test indicate that in general there was little change in staff attitudes toward standardization.

3.2.4 Summary: Attitudes toward Work and Standardization--Little Influenced

The pilot test of the workbook does not appear to have influenced staff attitudes toward work. Overall staff responses to the idea of standardization and to the workbook as the method of standardization also remained fairly steady for the duration of the pilot. It would appear that the workbook has had little influence on attitudes toward work and standardization.

3.3 EVALUATION OF THE WORKBOOK

Subsection 3.3 Directory

Opinions of the Workbook

3.3.1 Majority Would Use the Workbook (I-25)

3.3.2 Most Favor the Idea of Standardization (I-26)

3.3.3 Workbook Met Most Users' Expectations (I-27)

Experience with the Workbook

3.3.4 Plurality Think Case Documentation Improved (I-28)

3.3.5 Usefulness of the Workbook (I-29)

- o Most useful for "quickie" and typical cases; least useful for complex cases (I-29)
- o Most respondents complete workbook after the investigation (I-30)

3.3.6 Effect on Case Investigation Effort (I-32)

- o Workbook took more time for a large proportion of respondents (I-32)
- o Easier to meet program standards (I-33)
- o Number of case contacts stayed the same (I-33)
- o Summary--no change overall (I-34)

3.3.7 Open-Ended Comments and Suggestions for Improvement (I-35)

- o Minor changes (I-35)
- o Major changes (I-36)
- o General reactions (I-37)

3.3.9 Summary--Reactions to Workbook, Though Mixed, Tended toward Positive (I-38)

Findings concerning the workbook are taken from the three surveys carried out over the course of the pilot test. Two kinds of data were collected. Quantitative data were collected concerning opinions of and reactions to use of the workbook. Each survey also included required and/or optional comment sections.

3.3.1 Majority Would Use the Workbook

The key finding concerning the workbook is that 63% of the respondents reported that they probably or definitely would use the workbook (table I-4).

TABLE I-4
Using the Workbook--Pro and Con

Responses to the question
"If it were entirely your choice
would you continue to use the CIDSS workbook?"

Response Categories	Number of Specialists	Number of Supervisors	Percentages
Definitely No	5	-	18% No
Probably No	13	2	
Not Sure	10	1	
Probably Yes	28	2	63% Yes
Definitely Yes	19	4	

The question does not address whether or not respondents would dislike being required to use it. But only 18% reported that they would probably or definitely not use the workbook if it were their choice.

3.3.2 Most Favor the Idea of Standardization

On three occasions, pilot test staff were asked whether a standardized workbook was a good idea: before training, after training, and at the end of the pilot. Most of the respondents did not see the workbook before training, so they were asked whether a standardized investigation guide was a good idea for CPS. After training and after the pilot, staff were asked whether the CIDSS workbook was good idea for CPS. Before training 75.7% of respondents indicated that a standardized guide was probably or definitely a good idea (table I-5).

TABLE I-5
Opinions on the Idea of Standardization

Reactions to the question "do you think that the use of a standardized investigation guide is a good idea for child protective services?"

Response Category	Before Training		After Training		After Pilot Test	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Definitely No	0	-	0	-	0	-
Probably No	2	2.4%	3	3.5%	6	7.1%
Not Sure	18	21.4%	23	26.7%	13	15.3%
Probably Yes	36	42.4%	44	51.2%	39	45.9%
Definitely Yes	28	33.3%	16	18.6%	27	31.8%
Total % Yes		75.7%		69.8%		77.7%

After being trained in use of the CIDSS workbook, staff were somewhat less optimistic, with 69.8% reporting they probably or definitely felt that the workbook was a good idea. Most notably, the percentage of

"Definitely Yes" responses dropped from 33.3% to only 18.6%. After four months of use 77.7% of respondents reported that the CIDSS workbook was probably or definitely a good idea. Also, the percentage of "Definitely Yes" responses was up to 31.8%, only one person different from the prepilot finding of 33.3%.

3.3.3 Workbook Met Most Users' Expectations

An additional question was asked to expand upon the opinions presented in subsections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 and to ensure comparability of findings about the idea of standardization vs. the CIDSS workbook. After training, staff were asked whether the CIDSS workbook met their expectations. Nearly half of the trainees (48.8%) reported that the workbook did meet their expectations (table I-6).

TABLE I-6
CIDSS Workbook: Realization vs. Expectations

Responses to the statement "The CIDSS workbook is _____ than expected."

Response Category	Respondents	Percent
Much Better	12	14.0
Better	25	29.1
As Expected	42	48.8
Worse	7	8.1
Much Worse	0	-

The CIDSS workbook failed to meet the expectations of only 8.1% of the trainees. The fact that 91.8% reported that the workbook at least met their expecta-

tions supports the earlier finding of little if any shift in responses from pretraining opinions on the idea of standardization to the post-training evaluation of the CIDSS workbook. In other words, the workbook was as good or better than what staff expected of a standardized guide. The only notable difference is that post-training responses tended to be more conservative, with a larger portion of responses in the "Probably Yes" category.

3.3.4 Plurality Think Case Documentation Improved

Pilot test staff were asked to compare the workbook to previous methods of recording by agreeing or disagreeing with three statements:

- o (Using the workbook has) improved the documentation in case records.
- o A workbook record is less clear than a record before the pilot test.
- o The workbook record makes it hard to really understand the case.

For this report the second and third statements are converted to positive statements and the response categories are recoded to standardize higher numbers as more desirable responses.

Table I-7 shows that 58.3% of the respondents agreed that use of the workbook improved documentation. Nearly half (45.1%) of the respondents reported that a workbook record was not less clear than previous investigation records, and 50.6% said that an investigation recorded in the workbook was not hard to

TABLE I-7
Workbook's Effect on Documenting Case Investigation

Response Category	Improved Documentation No.	%	Not Less Clear No.	%	Not Hard To Understand No.	%
Disagree Strongly	7	8.3%	4	4.9%	6	7.2%
Disagree	9	10.7%	10	12.2%	8	9.6%
Disagree Somewhat	5	6.0%	11	13.4%	15	18.1%
Neither	14	16.7%	20	24.4%	12	14.5%
Agree Somewhat	23	27.4%	15	18.3%	13	15.7%
Agree	20	23.8%	20	24.4%	26	31.3%
Agree Strongly	6	7.1%	2	2.4%	2	3.6%
Total % Agree		58.3%		45.1%		50.6%

understand. On the other hand 16.7% felt that the workbook did not improve documentation 25.6% said workbook recordings are less clear and 27.7% reported that the workbook records are hard to understand.

3.3.5 Usefulness of the Workbook

Most Useful for "Quickie" and Typical Cases; Least Useful for Complex Cases. Three survey questions asked whether the workbook was especially good for recording (1) "quickie," (2) complex, and (3) typical cases. The respondents tended to agree that the workbook was especially good for recording quickie and typical cases. Table I-8 shows that 47.7% disagreed with the statement "The workbook is especially good for recording complex cases."

TABLE I-8
Type of Cases Workbook is Useful For

Responses to the statement "The workbook is especially good for . . ."

Response Category	Quickie No.	Quickie %	Complex No.	Complex %	Typical No.	Typical %
Disagree Strongly	7	8.3%	4	4.8%	1	1.2%
Disagree	9	10.7%	21	25.0%	2	2.4%
Disagree Somewhat	9	10.7%	15	17.9%	4	4.8%
Neither	8	9.5%	11	13.1%	14	16.7%
Agree Somewhat	11	13.1%	12	14.3%	25	29.8%
Agree	26	31.0%	15	17.9%	30	35.7%
Agree Strongly	14	16.7%	6	7.1%	8	9.5%
Total % Agree		60.8%		39.3%		75.0%

Respondent comments identify two possible explanations for the disagreement. First, several comments and discussions indicated that cases involving a lot of people, especially cases with several victims and/or perpetrators, required so many pages that it was difficult to keep track of case relationships and keep the workbook properly organized. Second, in complex cases, the workbook space allocation is inadequate. For example, recording the text of explanations for several allegations requires additional pages.

Most Respondents Complete Workbook after the Investigation. Two survey questions asked how the workbook was used in an investigation. Table I-9 shows that 39% of the respondents agree with the statement "I refer to the workbook as I do the investigation."

TABLE I-9
When Respondents Use the Workbook--
during or after Investigation

Response Category	During Investigation No.	%	After Investigation Largely Completed No.	%
Disagree Strongly	3	3.7%	0	-
Disagree	15	18.3%	3	3.7%
Disagree Somewhat	6	7.3%	6	7.3%
Neither	26	31.7%	2	25.6%
Agree Somewhat	19	23.2%	12	14.6%
Agree	11	13.4%	36	43.9%
Agree Strongly	2	2.4%	4	4.9%
Total % Agree		39.0%		63.4%

The table also shows that at least 29.3% of the respondents do not use the workbook as a guide during the investigation. It is possible that some staff who responded "Neither" do not refer to the workbook.

Only 11% of the respondents disagreed with the statement "I fill out the workbook after the investigation is substantially completed." Most of the respondents (63.4%) agreed that they complete the workbook after the investigation.

3.3.6 Effect on Case Investigation Effort

The responses to three statements address the evaluation question "Does use of the workbook change the level of effort required to investigate a case?"

Workbook Took More Time for a Large Proportion of Respondents. Responses to the statement that use of the workbook has not "increased time to complete documentation" show that 47.0% of the respondents disagreed. They reported that the workbook took longer to complete (table I-10).

TABLE I-10
Workbook's Effect on Case Documentation Time

Responses to the Statement
"Use of the workbook has not
"increased time to complete case documentation."

Response Category	Number	Percent
Disagree Strongly	8	9.6%
Disagree	20	24.1%
Disagree Somewhat	11	13.3%
Neither	20	24.1%
Agree Somewhat	8	9.6%
Agree	13	15.7%
Agree Strongly	2	3.6%
Total % Agree		28.9%

Only 28.9% of the respondents indicated that the workbook did not take longer to complete than previous recording forms, and 24.1% neither agreed nor disagreed. In other words, when using the CIDSS workbook 53.0% of the respondents take the same amount of time or less time to complete a case investigation record.

Easier to Meet Program Standards. Most (77.4%) of the respondents agreed that "the workbook makes it easier to meet program standards" (table I-11). Only 10 (11.9%) of the respondents reported that the workbook does not make it easier to meet program standards.

TABLE I-11
Workbook's Effect on Meeting Program Standards

Responses to the statement
"The workbook makes it easier
to meet program standards."

Response Category	Respondents Number	Percent
Disagree Strongly	1	1.2%
Disagree	3	3.6%
Disagree Somewhat	6	7.1%
Neither	9	10.7%
Agree Somewhat	21	25.0%
Agree	36	42.9%
Agree Strongly	8	9.5%
Total % Agree		77.4%

Number of Cases Contacts Stayed the Same. The last statement concerning effort is "Since using the

workbook I find that I make fewer contacts to complete a case." Nearly half, 47.6%, of the respondents disagreed (table I-12).

TABLE I-12
Workbook's Effect on Number of Case Contacts

Responses to the statement
"Since using the workbook I find that I make fewer contacts to complete a case."

Response Category	Respondents Number	Percent
Disagree Strongly	8	9.8%
Disagree	20	24.4%
Disagree Somewhat	11	13.4%
Neither	30	36.6%
Agree Somewhat	6	7.3%
Agree	6	7.3%
Agree Strongly	1	1.2%
Total % Agree		15.8%

Only 15.8% agreed that they made fewer contacts. This indicates that staff are making as many or more contacts using the workbook as they did under their previous recording procedure.

Summary--No Change in Overall Effort. In short, using the workbook took longer to document cases but made it easier to meet program standards. There was no change in the number of cases contacts. On balance, using the workbook produced no change in the level of effort required to investigate cases.

3.3.7 Open-Ended Comments and Suggestions for Improvements

Comments (especially those in response to the question "how would you change the workbook?") provide some direction for resolving problems staff identified when they used the workbook. The most frequent response was a compliment or a statement similar to "no changes needed now." The following lists summarize respondents' recommendations for changes and their general reactions.

Minor Changes. Respondents suggested the following minor changes:

- Change the title Summary of Referrals to Summary of Previous Referrals.

- Add clerical tracking line(s)--(clerk's name and date of entry).

- Problems with continuity drew detailed suggestions:

  > Summary of contacts, location good, but reading cases I found myself flipping back and forth to assessment pages. I would place description of injuries in section H where evaluation of children is, reverse G and H because injuries are described first in investigation.

(Put) adult's explanation first as this is done (first). I think evaluations are made at a later point in investigations, so for continuity they should be later in format.

- Add a space for complainant name and address.
- Add a form letter to notify complainant of case finding.
- For brief investigations, have an optional format with multiple people per page.
- Add a place for school/alternate care addresses.
- Add page numbers.
- Leave larger margins to allow space for right or top hole punch.
- Improve definition of "extent" on risk-assessment page.
- Give brief directions in workbook.

Major Changes. Respondents suggested the following major changes:

- Add a short form or system for recording simple and/or moved and/or invalid referrals.
- Add more space and/or more pages to facilitate recording complex cases.

- Add a checklist of services to document services used and/or offered.

General Reactions. Most of the praise for the workbook focused on how well it represented typical cases and the fact that the record is concise and easy to review. The most frequent negative observation was that the workbook had a fragmented appearance. Many staff noted that the workbook did not lend itself to recording investigations of complex cases. In particular, they noted that institutional, day care, and sex abuse cases are difficult to record.

A comment on the closing page of a Final Evaluation Survey does a good job of summarizing the comments about improving the workbook.

> I think the form is excellent for recording everything required by standards. I think I record so much more pertinent information that was omitted from the straight narrative, and that is good. However, it is very time-consuming and makes for longer recording times. I know the aim is to get to a computer system for recording, but so much of the information in these cases cannot be recorded with just check marks. I know we will continue to use the form in this area so we are all getting used to it. Because our work load is getting heavier all the time we are not too pleased to have something that takes more time. You have done an excellent job with this, and--as with anything that is worthwhile--it takes time.

3.3.8 Summary--Workbook Evaluation: Reactions, Though Mixed, Tended toward Positive

Staff reactions to the workbook are mixed but tended to be positive. Nearly 70 percent of respondents said the workbook was a better method of documenting case investigations. Most pilot test staff agreed that the workbook is especially good for recording quickie and typical cases, but nearly half said that it was not good for recording complex cases. Comments indicated that the complex cases included investigation of sex abuse, day care, and institutional referrals. Several staff suggested that the initial pages of the workbook be reorganized to reduce the need to flip among pages. They feel that the workbook can more closely reflect the sequence of an investigation.

3.4 EVALUATION OF TRAINING

Subsection 3.4 Directory

3.4.1 Completing the Workbook and Understanding the Model (I-40)

- o One-third of trainees completed workbook inaccurately (I-40)
- o Accuracy lowest at first training site--Houston (I-41)
- o Understanding the model also lowest at Houston (I-42)
- o Summary: more and better training needed (I-42)

3.4.2 Trainee Evaluations of the Workshop (I-43)

- o Instructors and material rated favorably (I-43)
- o Most and least helpful parts of training (I-44)
- o Suggestions for improving the workshop (I-45)
- o Summary: most rated the training favorably (I-45)

3.4.3 Additional Training Needs (I-46)

3.4.4 Relations between Training and Workbook Findings (I-47)

- o Staff with lower training scores overestimated their proficiency in field use of the workbook (I-47)
- o Negative attitudes toward standardization correlated with poorer understanding of the RIF/RAF model (I-47)

3.4.5 Summary: Evaluation of Training (I-51)

Four types of questions were used to evaluate the training (Appendix A). First, a test determined how well the trainees could complete a workbook exercise and how well they understood the RIF-RAF model. Second, the trainees were asked about the quality of the instructor's presentation and the training content. Third, the trainees were asked to identify the most and least helpful parts of the workshop. Finally, after training and after the pilot test they were asked open-ended questions to identify ways to improve the training. Subsections 3.4.1 to 3.4.4 present analyses of the answers to these questions, and subsection 3.4.5 summarizes the findings.

3.4.1 Completing the Workbook and Understanding the Model

One-Third of Trainees Completed Workbook Inaccurately. To test CPS specialists' ability to complete the workbook, they were asked to transcribe a paragraph of case narrative into a workbook. Workbook completion was scored on a scale from 1 to 3. Trainees who did not attempt or did not complete the exercise were rated 0, and their scores were not considered in the analyses. If they attempted to complete the exercise but missed entries or recorded data incorrectly, they received a score of 1--below expectation. A score of 2, meets expectation, represents entry of a minimum of relevant data in the appropriate places and no incorrect entries. If transcription into the workbook was exactly accurate the score was 3--exceeds expectation.

Table I-13 shows the breakdown of scores. Six staff did not complete the exercise, and 27 ranked "below expectation." Thus, over one-third of the

trainees who completed the exercise were unable to satisfactorily complete the workbook. This finding indicates that training did not adequately prepare the CPS staff to complete the workbook accurately.

TABLE I-13
Trainee Scores for Entering Information into the Workbook

Exercise score	Trainees	Percent
0 not completed	6	7.0%
1 below expectation	27	31.4%
2 meets expectation	43	50.0%
3 exceeds expectation	10	11.6%
Total	86	100.0%

Accuracy Lowest at First Training Site--Houston. Calculating the scores across training sites shows that there are small differences in the ability of trainees at each site to transcribe information into the workbook.

Trainees in Houston received training first and had the lowest average score (table I-14). After training in Houston, the curriculum was revised to include in-

TABLE I-14
Trainee Scores by Location of Training

Training Site	Average Score	Respondents
Houston	1.56	25
Rio Grande Valley	1.77	26
Victoria	1.76	21
Total	1.69	72

creased dialogue between the trainer and trainees and more emphasis on going through the workbook section-by-section. The difference in scores may be due to this increased emphasis on discussion and/or explanation of each section. Supervisors' scores (table I-15) were approximately the same as the scores of CPS specialists.

TABLE I-15
Trainees Scores by Position

Position	Average Score	Respondents
Specialist	1.68	37
Supervisor	1.63	8

Understanding the Model Also Lowest at Houston. Each of the three RIF factors (event, effect and dynamics) was scored separately. For each factor, the number of correctly marked cells was counted as "hits" and the number of incorrectly marked cells as "errors." Scores were computed for each factor as (2 * hits) - errors. The three scores were totaled to determine a score for understanding of the model. Scores are summarized in table I-16. Scores on knowledge of the model are higher at Victoria and the Rio Grande Valley and lowest at Houston, where the first training session was carried out.

Summary: More and Better Training Needed. Scores on the two exercises covering the content of the training were lower than expected. Trainees in Houston scored the lowest. Houston was trained first, and the training was revised based on feedback from Houston staff. The lower scores are probably due to the fact that the other sites received an improved version of

TABLE I-16
Scores for Matching Model Sections
and Workbook Sections

Site	Average Score	Respondent
Houston	3.3	25
Rio Grande Valley	7.5	26
Victoria	5.8	21

the training. Average scores for all trainees on both exercises indicate that more and/or better training is required to adequately prepare case investigation specialists and supervisors.

3.4.2 Trainee Evaluations of the Workshop

Instructors and Material Rated Favorably. Most specialists and supervisors reported that the "instructor demonstrated a genuine interest in this material." They also reported that the "instructor presented the material coherently,...." Table I-17 is a breakdown of the actual responses. Four people

TABLE I-17
Trainees' Opinions of Instructors and Material

Response	Interest in Material	Coherent Material
Definitely Yes	30	19
Yes	34	33
Neutral	3	11
No	0	2
Definitely No	0	2

reported that the training material was not coherent, and none reported that the instructor did not display an interest in the material.

Most and Least Helpful Parts of Training. The training evaluation included two open-ended questions on the helpfulness of the workshop: (1) What part(s) of the workshop will be most helpful to you in doing your job? and (2) What part(s) of the workshop will be least helpful in doing your job?

Forty-four CPS specialists responded to the first question. The description of the most helpful parts of the workshop fit into four categories:

1. all of the training--10 responses;

2. step-by-step working through use of the workbook--9 responses;

3. working on example(s)--6 responses;

4. background and explanation of workbook and purpose--5 responses.

Ten of the responses did not address the question or could not be interpreted by the evaluator.

Eighteen respondents identified the least helpful parts of the workshop. Nine of the responses fit into three categories used to identify the most useful aspects of the workshop; three other responses fit into a fourth category:

1. all of the training--3 responses;

2. step-by-step working through the workbook--3 responses;

3. working on examples--3 responses;

4. negative attitudes and comments of trainees--3 responses.

Of the remaining 6 statements, 5 were praise for the workshop, and 1 individual reported that "presentation of the (RIF/RAF) model was dull and redundant." The statements concerning the examples were critical of their quality, not of examples per se, and two of the CPS specialists who criticized the examples identified examples as a way to improve the workshop (in response to another question).

Suggestions for Improving the Workshop. Six of the 20 CPS specialist responding to the question "What suggestions do you have for improving the workshop" reported that they wouldn't know until they used the workbook. Four others used the space to note that the form needed to be linked with automation (not part of this pilot). Nine responses were split between wanting more examples (5 respondents) and suggesting that the workshop curriculum needed to be better planned and organized (4 respondents). One CPS specialist suggested a sound system and one large table for the trainees.

Summary: Most Rated the Training Favorably. Responses to the three open-ended questions tended to praise the quality and content of the training. This is consistent with the high ratings given for quality of presentation and material. In general, the trainees reported that the examples were useful and that there should be more of them.

3.4.3 Additional Training Needs

The final evaluation question "What additional information, support, or training would have been helpful?" elicited 35 comments from 86 staff (Appendix A). Comments ranged from "if ... using ... computers (staff) would feel better about the system" to "how to use the workbook in real complex and difficult cases." Twenty-two of the comments requested three types of support (table I-18).

TABLE I-18
Additional Information, Support, or Training Requested

Type of Support	Respondents*
Clarification-Definitions-Instructions	10
Follow-up Training and/or Meeting	7
More Examples of Use	7
Training was Adequate or Good	4
Other	9

*Two respondents each requested two types of support.

Four staff stated that the training was adequate or good, and there were nine suggestions that were not supported by other comments or analyses. Of 86 pilot test staff who completed final evaluation questionnaires, 31 reported that they would have liked more support. The general tone of the comments was that they had too much uncertainty concerning use of the workbook.

3.4.4 Relations between Training and Workbook Findings

Scores from the workbook and the model exercise (described in subsection 3.4.1) were compated with several other data items collected during the evaluation. There are at least two useful findings among these relationships.

Staff with Lower Training Scores Overestimated Their Proficiency in Field Use of Workbook. Pilot test participants were asked "About how many weeks did it take before you felt comfortable and proficient in using the CIDSS workbook?"

Staff who scored highest on the workbook exercise reported the highest average time to become proficient with the workbook after they began using it in the pilot test. Table I-19 shows the average workbook exercise scores for respondents who reported that it took one to four weeks and more than four weeks to learn to use the workbook. Trainees whose scores reflected the most knowledge of how to use the workbook reported they took longer to learn to use the workbook in the field. Assuming that the training was useful and necessary, it is likely that staff who scored poorly and reported that they became proficient in a short time were using the workbook improperly.

Negative Attitudes toward Standardization Correlated with Poorer Understanding of the RIF/RAF Model. Pilot test staff were asked on three occasions how the workbook would affect (or did affect) their jobs. Before training, staff were asked about their expectations of a standardized guide.

TABLE I-19
Self-Assessed Proficiency vs. Tested Proficiency with the Workbook

Time needed to become "proficient" in field use of workbook	Average score on workbook exercise (during training)	No. of Staff
1 to 4 weeks	1.4	24
5 weeks or more	1.8	20

We are interested in learning how you think the use of a standardized investigation guide will change your job and the work you do. A number of possible changes are listed below. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement* by checking the appropriate numbered box on the seven-point scale.

1. Increase my workload
2. Increase the freedom I have on my job
3. Improve the quality of work I produce
4. Make it more difficult to meet deadlines
5. Make it difficult to do a good job
6. Make my work more challenging
7. Make my work more frustrating
8. Decrease the discretion I exercise on my job
9. Increase my ability to get work done
10. Make it easier to keep up with my work load
11. Make my job more interesting

*For analysis, the 1 to 7 Likert scales were standardized to make 7 the most desirable score, and the 11 scores were averaged.

After training, staff were asked to respond to the same statements in terms of the workbook.

> Now that you are familiar with the CIDSS workbook, how do you think the workbook will change your job and the work you do? A number of possible changes are listed below. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking the appropriate number on the seven-point scale.

At the end of the pilot, staff were asked to rate the same 11 statements in terms of the effect of the workbook on their jobs.

> We are interested in learning how the CIDSS investigation guide has changed your job and the work you do. A number of possible changes are listed below. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking the appropriate numbered box on the seven-point scale.

Table I-20 shows that on all three occasions, trainees who scored lowest on the model exercise were most likely to report that standardization and the workbook would or did have a negative impact on their job.

The percentage of staff disagreeing, neutral, and agreeing is fairly constant across the three evaluation surveys. There are at least two potential explanations for changes in the pattern of scores shown in table I-20. First, the low average exercise score of 3.7 is from staff expecting that standardization will have a negative impact on their jobs. The fact that the low scores tend to stay in the disagree row may indicate

that individuals with negative expectations tended not to learn the RIF-RAF Model.

TABLE I-20
Scores on Model Exercises versus Attitudes toward Standardization and the Workbook
(Job Change Rating)

	Model Exercise Scores					
Job Change Rating[1]	Before Pilot score	% resp	After Training score	% resp	After Pilot score	% resp
disagree						
under 3.5	3.7	15.9%	4.2	14.3%	4.8	15.2%
neutral						
3.5 - 4.5	6.1	43.2%	5.1	45.2%	4.6	50.0%
agree						
over 3.5	5.6	40.9%	5.1	40.5%	6.0	34.8%
number of staff	44		84		46	

1. Averaged responses to the 11 statements listed on page (I-48). Higher scores indicate respondents think that standardization and the workbook will produce a positive change in their job sitations.

Second, the highest average model exercise scores move from the neutral category, 6.1 before the pilot, to the agree category, 6.0 after the pilot. This finding indicates that understanding the model may contribute to a positive evaluation of the workbook. Taken together, these two findings support the need for training that explains the RIF/RAF Model so that staff have a good understanding of it.

In short, individuals who had low expectations of standardization did not get a good understanding of the model. Staff who understood the model were likely to report, at the end of the pilot, that the workbook had a desirable influence on their job.

3.4.5 Summary: Evaluation of Training

Staff who were trained in Edinberg showed the best understanding of the RIF-RAF Model and had the highest scores on the workbook exercise. Across the three sites, supervisors scored about the same as specialists on the workbook exercise and the RIF-RAF exercise. On one hand, the respondents gave the training a very positive evaluation. On the other hand, nearly a third of the pilot test staff reported that they would have liked more support in the form of definitions of terms, instructions, examples, and/or follow-up meetings or training sessions. The exercise scores support a finding that the training provided was not adequate. Analyses of training and workbook findings show that effective training is likely to facilitate acceptance and appropriate use of the workbook.

3.5 EVALUATION OF THE PILOT TEST

Subsection 3.5 Directory

3.5.1 Supervisors Rated Pilot Test Favorably on User and Setting Factors (I-53)

3.5.2 Supervisors Also Rated Pilot Favorably on Innovation Factors (I-54)

3.5.3 Pattern of Supervisors' Average Ratings: A Dip in the Middle of the Pilot Test with an Uptick at the End (I-57)

3.5.4 Supervisors' Comments on the Implementation Factors Questionnaire (I-58)

- o Comments on innovation factors (I-58)
- o Comments on user and setting factors (I-60)

3.5.5 Summary--Evaluation of the Pilot: Most Supervisors' Views Positive at End of Test (I-60)

The progress of the pilot test was evaluated by having supervisors complete the Implementation Factors Questionnaire (Appendix B) at the beginning, middle, and end of the pilot. The questionnaire tracks 24 factors known to be important to successful implementation of planned change. Supervisors read 24 statements that described the most desirable pilot test circumstances. They were asked to note how accurately the statement described the CIDSS workbook pilot project. They indicated their level of agreement or disagreement with each statement on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (7) with 4 as the neutral or don't know score. (Note therefore that lower scores are favorable, higher scores unfavorable.)

The first 12 questions asked about user and setting factors that could influence the operation of the pilot. The next 12 questions, which asked about innovation factors, elicited supervisors' perceptions of the CIDSS workbook. The questionnaire had two purposes. First it allowed project management to identify and address problems and thereby to increase the likelihood that the pilot would provide a good test of the workbook. Second, it identified problems and issues in implementation that could influence decisions on how and whether to implement the workbook in more sites.

3.5.1 Supervisors Rated Pilot Test Favorably on User and Setting Factors

For each user and setting factor in table I-21, the average ratings at the end of the pilot were better than at the beginning and midpoint. For two factors ("3. It will be easy to retain experienced workbook users" and "7. Current job descriptions cover required

roles") there was little change in scores over the course of the pilot. However, these scores are in the "agree" range, and these are two factors that project management had little or no opportunity to influence.

3.5.2 Supervisors Also Rated Pilot Favorably on Innovation Factors

Examination of supervisors' responses to questions on innovation factors shows that their ratings of the pilot test improved over the course of its operation (table I-22). Supervisors' ratings of innovation factors were best at the end of the pilot and worst at the midpoint. In all cases their average responses were between the neutral and agree scores.

TABLE I-21
Supervisors' Assessments
of User and Setting Factors

User and Setting Factors	Average Score* Week 1	Week 8	End
1. Staff are aware of expected benefits, cost, & procedures.	3.0	3.0	2.5
2. Staff have skills and knowledge needed.	2.5	2.5	2.0
3. It will be easy to retain experienced workbook users.	3.4	3.4	3.1
4. Staff perceive the need for using the workbook.	3.4	3.2	2.7
5. Staff are motivated to give the workbook a fair trial.	3.3	3.0	2.5
6. Staff accept the workbook as legitimate practice.	2.9	3.2	2.8
7. Current job descriptions cover required roles.	2.4	2.5	2.3
8. Facilities, equipment, and funds are available.	2.4	2.5	2.3
9. Current procedures accommodate demands of the workbook.	2.9	3.4	2.3
10. Leaders at all levels strongly endorse the workbook.	3.4	3.0	2.7
11. Rules are in place to guide use of the workbook.	3.5	2.8	2.3
12. I can identify and address factors that hinder proper use.	2.6	3.1	2.3
Average	3.0	3.4	2.7
Number of Supervisors	8	14	14

*1 = strongly agree; 7 = strongly disagree; 4 is the neutral point or "don't know" response.

TABLE I-22
Supervisors' Assessments of Innovation Factors

Innovation Factors	Average Scores* Week 1	Week 8	End
1. Benefits, costs, procedures for use of workbook are clear.	3.4	3.3	2.5
2. Procedures for getting, using, and storing are simple.	2.8	3.3	2.1
3. The workbook configuration is stable.	3.6	3.9	3.1
4. There is strong need for the workbook at this site.	3.3	3.4	2.8
5. Beyond meeting the need, the workbook has obvious advantages.	2.5	3.0	2.3
6. The effectiveness of the workbook is observable.	3.3	3.0	2.3
7. The workbook is fully developed and readily available.	3.6	3.7	2.9
8. Workbook performance is highly reliable.	3.6	3.6	3.0
9. The workbook is easy to maintain and upgrade.	3.0	3.4	2.5
10. Acquisition costs for the workbook are quite reasonable.	3.3	3.4	2.9
11. Operational costs for workbook use are low.	3.4	3.3	3.0
12. Renewal costs are minimum.	3.3	3.4	2.7
AVERAGE	3.0	3.4	2.7
Number of Supervisors	8	14	14

*On the 7-point Likert scale, 1 = strongly agree; 7 = strongly disagree; (4) is neutral or don't know.

3.5.3 Pattern of Supervisors' Average Ratings: A Dip in the Middle of the Pilot Test with an Uptick at the End

The pattern of average ratings in tables I-21 and I-22 was consistent across each of the three pilot sites: somewhat favorable at first, less so in Week 8, and most favorable at the end of the pilot test (figure I-3).



Figure I-3. Pattern of Change in Supervisors' Views on the Workbook during the Pilot Project. The curve shows supervisors' average responses to both (1) user and setting factors and (2) innovations factors as gathered in the implementation factors survey.

There are at least two potential explanations for the pattern. First, when supervisors completed the first questionnaire their staff had only one week of experience with the workbook. In other words, the supervisors may not have received adequate feedback from investigators to fully critique the workbook or the pilot test procedures. As they gained experience they were better informed and better able to critique. As a result, the midpoint ratings were worse than the initial ratings. As the pilot progressed and problems

were solved, opinion became more positive, and the final ratings were better then in Week 1 and Week 8.

Second, several substantive problems were identified in Week 1 questionnaires. A memo responding to and resolving most of these problems was distributed at the same time as the Week 8 questionnaire. Responses to the Week 8 questionnaire identified fewer problems and showed proportionally fewer disagree ratings, but the average ratings were not as high as in Week 1. The poorer Week 8 ratings may be due to the fact that for the previous seven weeks the problems identified at Week 1 had not been resolved. Resolving them at Week 8 could have helped cause the improvement in the ratings at the end of the pilot test.

3.5.4 Supervisors' Comments on the Implementation Factors (IF) Questionnaire

Supervisors were asked to explain any "disagree" response in a specific format. The request was "If you coded any responses in the darkened area please use this page to explain your response. In other words, if you do not agree with the statement please tell us (a) what has happened to cause you to disagree; (b) who or what organizational unit can resolve the problem; (c) what can be done to change future entries to agree."

Comments on Innovation Factors. Explanatory comments on the workbook (the innovation) covered three general areas.

- Definitions--Most supervisors felt that they needed more definitions for terms used in the workbook and clarification of just what information is appropriate to record in which sections of the workbook. Two supervisors pointed out

that they recognized that the pilot was intended to help define terms and clarify how the workbook should be used.

- Changes--Several supervisors recommended changes in the workbook. Several noted that it tended to be bulky and repetitious. Substantive suggestions were to add a "moved" disposition; to add a collateral contacts page, and to develop a procedure for handling repeat referrals on an open case.

- Quality of Casework--Supervisors expressed concern over the quality of casework done by investigators using the workbook. They reported a fear that the workbook focuses on standards, not on good casework. Most of these comments were punctuated with observations concerning good aspects of the workbook.

The first two types of comments, need for definitions and for changes in the workbook, dominated the Week 1 IF Questionnaire comments but were absent from the IF Questionnaire given at the end of the pilot. Comments that raised the issue of quality of casework were the only type made in the end-of-pilot IF Questionnaire and were absent from the Week 1 IF Questionnaire.

The absence of definition and change criticisms in the end-of-pilot IF Questionnaire may be due to the fact that as these substantive concerns were raised, the project director addressed and resolved them. However, during the pilot test it was not possible to address many of the concerns about quality. Also, as supervisors gained experience with the workbook they were collecting completed workbooks, which they could

compare with cases completed using other procedures. So, while there was not much basis for criticizing quality of effort at the outset of the pilot, by the end there was a set of workbooks to judge and compare. This may explain the fact that most of the "quality" criticisms were made at the end of the pilot.

Comments on User and Setting Factors. Most of the explanatory comments on user and setting factors were made in the Week 1 questionnaires. There are several types of comments that can be summarized as follows:

- Staff are motivated to use the workbook because they feel it is inevitable rather than thinking it is a good thing; some think it is bad.

- The workbook is not cost-effective, and without computers it will not be.

- Staff turnover is a problem.

These comments represent a minority viewpoint, and they document the presence of some resistance to the workbook. It is notable that 8 supervisors wrote 11 explanations at Week 1, and 14 supervisors wrote only 6 comments at the end of the pilot. This observation is consistent with the finding that supervisors' ratings of the pilot test were highest at the end.

3.5.5 Summary--Evaluation of the Pilot: Supervisors' Views Positive at End of Test

The Implementation Factors Questionnaire documented the progress of the pilot test and shows that (1) supervisors opinions of the workbook and the pilot test were positive and were most positive at the end of

the pilot; and (2) the workbook is at least a viable, and probably a good, alternative to previous methods of recording case investigations.

3.6 SUMMARY OF OVERALL FINDINGS

Attitudes toward Work and Standardization. The pilot test of the workbook does not appear to have influenced staff attitudes toward work. Overall staff responses concerning the idea of standardization and the workbook as the method of standardization remained fairly steady for the duration of the pilot. At the end of the pilot, 63% of the respondents reported that they probably or definitely would use the workbook if the choice was theirs to make.

Evaluation of the Workbook. Reactions to the workbook were mixed but generally positive. After four months of use 77.7% of respondents reported that the CIDSS workbook was a good idea. They reported that the workbook was as good or better than what they expected of a standardized guide.

Nearly 70 percent of respondents said the workbook was a better method of documenting case investigations. Most pilot test staff agreed that the workbook is especially good for recording quickie and typical cases, but nearly half said that it was not good for recording complex cases. Comments indicated that the complex cases included investigation of sex abuse, day care, and institutional referrals. Several staff suggested that the initial pages (RIF) of the workbook be reorganized to reduce the need to flip among pages. They felt that the workbook can more closely reflect the sequence of an investigation.

Most of the respondents (63.4%) agreed that they complete the workbook after the investigation. In comparison with their previous procedures, 71.1% of the respondents reported that the CIDSS workbook took the same amount of time or less time to complete a case investigation record. Most (77.4%) of the respondents

agreed that "the workbook makes it easier to meet program standards."

Evaluation of Training. Scores on the two exercises covering the content of the training were lower than expected. Trainees in Houston scored the lowest. Houston held training first, and the training was revised based on feedback from Houston staff. The lower scores are probably due to the fact that the other sites received an improved version of the training.

Respondents gave the training a very positive evaluation. Trainees reported that the examples were helpful. But nearly a third of the pilot test staff reported that they would have liked more support in the form of definitions, instructions and examples, and/or follow-up meetings or training sessions.

The workbook and RIF-RAF exercise scores support a finding that the training provided was not adequate. Analyses of the exercise scores and workbook findings shows that the individuals who learned the most at training were most likely to have reported acceptance and appropriate use of the workbook.

Evaluation of Pilot Test. The Implementation Factors Questionnaire documented the progress of the pilot test and shows (1) that supervisors' opinions of the workbook and the pilot test were positive and were most positive at the end of the pilot; and (2) that the workbook is a viable, and probably a good, alternative to previous methods of recording case investigations.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation of the CIDSS manual workbook was designed to answer the following general questions:

1. How do workers respond to use of the workbook?

2. What are the problems with the layout or content of the workbook?

3. What types of training and support are necessary to support introduction and use of the workbook?

The evaluation also set out to identify implications the workbook evaluation might have for the content and organization of the CIDSS software. This section of the report discusses each of these questions and the associated findings.

How do workers respond to use of the workbook? The pilot test staff had generally positive reactions to the workbook. Nearly two-thirds of them said that they would probably or definitely continue to use the workbook if it were their decision to make.

Conclusion. Over three-quarters of the respondents agree that the workbook is a good idea.

What are the problems with the layout or content of the workbook? Responses concerning layout or content of the workbook were infrequent and did not identify any systematic problems.

Conclusion. Several respondents identified small changes that did not influence the model or workbook organization. Project managers are evaluating the potential benefits of these changes.

What types of training and support are necessary to support introduction and use of the workbook? A few problems were identified. The solutions to most of these problems consisted of better directions for using the workbook and more training, especially practice and examples. Frequently, training needs were specified as a "need for follow-up training."

Conclusion. It is appropriate to conclude that given (1) detailed training, (2) written directions on use of the workbook, and (3) training follow-up at one to two months, the workbook can and should be implemented statewide.

What are the implications for the CIDSS software? The format of the workbook was generally acceptable. Staff did not suggest revisions that influence the content or organization of the software. Staff comments recommend a high level of training and support during workbook implementation.

Conclusion. An implication of these comments is that the workbook and the software should be implemented separately to minimize the likelihood of training overload. Results of the training evaluation are consistent with this conclusion.

PART II

Impact Evaluation

AUTOMATED CIDSS

(Case Investigation Decision Support System)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the Case Decision Project was to design a system to assist CPS staff in the investigation of child abuse referrals--specifically with data collection, decision making, and work load management. The project developed the Case Investigation Decision Support System (CIDSS), which consists of two parts: (1) the manual investigation workbook and (2) the automated case investigation support system. Each component was designed to stand alone as an investigation documentation system or, in concert with the other, to form a more comprehensive system. The manual system was evaluated in Part I of this report. Part II of this report contains the evaluation of the automated case investigation support system.

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 INTRODUCTION

CIDSS' Place in CPS Automation. The Protective Services for Families and Children (PSFC) Branch has been engaged in an effort to automate Child Protective Services (CPS). This effort has been pursued in three stages.[1]

- The first stage, providing automated support for the intake function, has been completed.
- The second stage, automated support for case investigations, has been pilot-tested and is currently being redesigned for statewide implementation.
- The third stage, automated support for planning and managing cases that are opened for services is the most complex and sensitive of the three efforts and is still under development.

The three systems are linked: each system provides the initial input data for subsequent systems. At present, Automated MAPPER[2] Intake provides the initial referral documentation required to initiate an investigation. The information is entered at intake, elec-

---

[1] A chart of CPS's automation plan appeared in Part I, and others appear in the appendixes--e.g., Appendix C. Variations among these charts reflect changes in the automation plan as development proceeded and more was learned about what the plan should entail.

[2] Maintaining, Preparing, and Producing Executive Reports--a computer language.

tronically transmitted to an investigation supervisor, and electronically assigned by the supervisor to a CPS specialist. The CPS specialist then reviews the intake information and begins using the recording features of the software.

The software is backed up by the manual case investigation workbook, which is a paper representation of the software system. The software and the workbook are based on a model that increases the objectivity of an investigation. The workbook provides a standardized approach to investigation and a field recording medium and guide that reinforces the software structure.

Purposes of CIDSS. The case investigation software and the workbook were developed to--

1. Standardize recording of case investigations. The software provides a standardized format for recording and reporting investigation results. Standardization makes communication easier and helps ensure complete and adequate case records.

2. Support the collection (recording), analysis, and use of information pertinent to the decision to open or close a case. The software requires recording of pertinent data and prints or displays the information in formats that support appropriate use of investigation findings and an objective approach to decision making.

3. Automate certain case management tasks. The system requires certain case management tasks to be performed by using the software: case assignment, case transfer, and case closure. These tasks can only be performed by the supervisor. The soft-

ware automatically captures the date andtime that the task was performed and stores it asthe official time of completion.

4. Provide automated management information reporting. The software gives on-line management information, which allows managers to track the status of intake and investigation cases and to generate management reports on demand.

Several enhancements of this system have been planned or are being developed. Two major enhancements are--

- o electronic update of state office data bases; and

- o automatic recognition of risk profiles.

1.2 CPS AUTOMATION PLAN

For the past several years, human service agencies have found themselves in a situation of declining resources and expanding client service needs. One way to address this problem is to reduce the cost of service delivery and improve the effectiveness of services delivered. Computers have helped private industry reduce overhead and lower costs. DHS, like many other public agencies, has invested in automation in hopes of replicating private industry success.

Information Needs. PSFC's automation goals include development of an information system that meets a broad range of needs For the specialist in the field these needs include--

- a standardized format for recording;
- quick retrieval, revision, and transfer of case information;
- automated production and transmission of required forms;
- support in meeting program requirements;
- case decision support systems;
- work load and caseload status summaries; and

For the supervisor, these needs include--

- more easily understood and interpreted records;
- automated systems to facilitate work load management; and
- unit work load and caseload status summaries.

For regional and state program staff these needs include--

- work load and performance summaries by program director, region, and branch;
- ability to describe and track the client population;
- management decision support; and
- policy testing (modeling) capability.

For several years, CPS automation has included statewide management information systems such as the Child Abuse and Neglect Report and Inquiry System (CANRIS) and the Social Services Management System (SSMS). CIDSS is an effort to provide field staff with direct access to automated support.

Automation Plan Stages. As mentioned earlier, PSFC's automation plan proceeds in three stages. The following paragraphs give further details on the functions at each stage.

The first stage, Automated MAPPER Intake (AMI), is software to automate and provide printing and telecommunications capability for CPS intake. Software to automate intake has been pilot tested and is currently in use by one intake site. As telecommunications and computer facilities become available, AMI will be implemented in additional sites.

The second stage, the Case Investigation Decision Support System (CIDSS) has two complementary parts: (1) the CIDSS workbook and (2) the automated CIDSS. The workbook has been pilot tested and is the subject of Part I of this evaluation report. CIDSS software has been tested in the field. The automated CIDSS is currently undergoing design refinements.

The third stage of software development includes automated support for planning and managing cases that are opened for services. These functions are currently in development and will be available by the first quarter of 1988.

Experience with the pilot test of software to automate intakes led the CIDSS staff to design the CIDSS pilot test as a cycle of prototyping and redesign. The prototyping method allows for the involvement of field staff in the design and implementation of the final system. Rather than write, pilot test, and

revise software, the project work group chose to develop a model of the investigation process, prototype it in paper form, then revise and retest it until a fairly stable format was developed.

1.3 DEVELOPING CIDSS

Subsections 1.3.1 through 1.3.4 describe development of CIDSS (see Subsection 1.3 Directory for subsection titles and page numbers).

Subsection 1.3 Directory

1.3.1 Introduction to CIDSS Development (II-6)
1.3.2 Development of Manual Workbook (II-7)
1.3.3 Development of RIF/RAF Model (II-8)
1.3.4 Software Design (II-10)

1.3.1 Introduction to CIDSS Development

Regional and state office staff determined that three essential tasks were required to meet the project objectives:

- Task 1--specify the data elements that need to be collected during an investigation in order to arrive at a sound decision about case disposition;
- Task 2--develop a model of the decision-making process; and

- Task 3--incorporate results of tasks 1 and 2 into an instrument that allows for ease of data collection by the caseworker and ease of reading by the supervisor.

1.3.2 Development of Manual Workbook

The first step in accomplishing these three tasks was to design a manual version of the Case Investigation Decision Support System (CIDSS). This manual workbook was submitted for review and modification to a group of CPS experts from across the state. One skilled practitioner from each of the 10 DHS regions was chosen, and--after an extensive review of the clinical and research literature on CPS--the first version of the manual workbook was developed.

After producing three revisions of the workbook, the work group agreed that no further development could take place without testing the workbook in the actual work environment. Field-testing would determine the final version of the data elements and the most useful format in which to display them. Field testing would also help the work group identify the factors necessary in making decisions during case investigation and assessment.

A field-ready version of the workbook was produced, and three sites in Texas volunteered to test it for 60 days. The workbook was introduced with only a basic overview, and the regional sites tested it for 30 days. At that time their recommendations for modifications were obtained and used to generate another revision. The revised workbook was then introduced to the same sites; after a further 30 to 45 days of use the

regional sites' recommendations were again solicited, and an improved version of the workbook was generated.

1.3.3 Development of RIF/RAF Model

Once the workbook had assumed a usable and relatively stable form, the developers decided that it should be tested at another site with the additional element of providing thorough training. During the process of developing this training, the initial form of the decision model first emerged. Relying on the results of the literature review and an analysis of how the workbook had been used in field-testing, a model was developed and introduced as the focus of the training.

The model, which later came to be called the RIF/RAF Model (Risk-Intensity Factors/Resource-Availability Factors), was based upon the idea that the decision to provide child protective services is a two-stage process (A chart of the model appeared in Part I of this report, and a slightly more detailed version appears in Appendix D).

Stage 1. Data from three general areas are collected and analyzed to determine the intensity of risk for abuse/neglect to the child. These areas are--

- Event: did the alleged abuse/neglect occur?
- Effect: how severe was the abuse/neglect, and what are its effects upon the child and the family?

- Environment: to what extent does the psychosocial and physical environment act to support or prevent the occurrence of abuse/neglect?

Stage 2. The second stage in the RIF/RAF Model is invoked only if some degree of risk intensity is determined in Stage 1. Resources available to reduce risk intensity are assessed in order to arrive at one of two case decisions: (1) to close the case or (2) to open the case for in-home services or removal of the child. The case decisions are assessed as follows:

- The Family: Does the nuclear and/or extended family have sufficient resources to reduce intensity of the risk? If so, the case can be closed.

- The Community: Are community resources available and accessible to the family to reduce the risk intensity? If so, the case can be closed after appropriate referrals are made.

- Child Protective Services: If the child is still at risk after the application of family and community resources, the family is eligible for child protective services. The level of risk at this point will determine the level of intervention (in-home services or removal).

The workbook was introduced to the new site with training based on the decision model and was tested for 60 days. Results from this test were presented with the results from the other field tests at a meeting of the work group. Another revision of the workbook resulted, and the work group determined that the workbook

was close enough to its final form that a formal pilot test and evaluation was called for. The work group decided that the pilot test should be conducted on all types of cases, in both rural and urban settings. Two regions that met the selection criteria volunteered as pilot sites: Region 11 (Houston) and Region 8 (Corpus Christi and the Rio Grande Valley).

1.3.4 Software Design

Software design began when the work group had specified the initial set of data items and produced a model workbook. The design proceeded through three stages--conceptual, general, and detailed design. At each stage decisions had to be about the hardware environment, software selection, and software functions.

Conceptual Design. The conceptual design stage coincided with identification of the data elements and design of the workbook (Appendix E). The conceptual design identified desired system features and functions and began to narrow the field of hardware and software options available.

General Design. The process of specifying the general design occurred while the workbook was being prototyped and pilot tested. Experience with the workbook had illustrated the value of prototyping and system flexibility.

The importance of flexibility in the system was underscored by the need to revise the Prompted Intake System to make it useful to intake staff. Precursor to Automated MAPPER Intake, the Prompted Intake System software forced CPS specialists to follow a rigid data entry pattern that did not always fit the language or sequence of information given by complainants. When revisions were needed to adjust the software to the

actual intake environment, the programming effort required was substantial. Recognition of this problem was one factor that led to reprogramming the intake software to be more flexible.

Detailed Design. Detailed design was carried out when it was apparent that the workbook pilot findings would support the workbook content and organization. The software to be piloted was a set of screen images of the workbook sections, including data elements and text entry areas. The recording environment included prompting and help features. The system was designed to be easy to use and to improve the quality of case investigation recording and CPS management support.

1.4 PILOT SITE IMPLEMENTATION

Subsections 1.4.1 through 1.4.3 describe introducing the automated CIDSS into the pilot sites.

Subsection 1.4 Directory

2.4.1 Implementation Strategy (II-11)
2.4.2 Implementation Problems (II-12)
2.4.3 Resolving Problems (II-13)

1.4.1 Implementation Strategy

The implementation strategy for the pilot site had three stages.

- Stage 1. The pilot staff received an orientation on the CIDSS manual workbook. The purpose was to familiarize them with the data elements and the RIF/RAF Model before they were intro-

duced to the automated system. Pilot site staff were trained on the CIDSS manual workbook and began using it for all investigations in March 1986.

- Stage 2. Intake staff were trained on the Automated MAPPER Intake (AMI) System and began operating AMI before full implementation of CIDSS. This sequence had to be followed because CIDSS cannot work unless AMI is functioning satisfactorily. AMI began operation in June 1986.

- Stage 3. The plan was to operate CIDSS with only two investigation units for a trial period of 30 days. At that point, a decision would be made as to the advisability of expansion to other units. This plan ensured that any major problems would have a limited impact and could be corrected before wide-scale implementation.

1.4.2 Implementation Problems

Stages 1 and 2 were carried out satisfactorily, but problems were encountered in trying to limit CIDSS implementation to only two units. After a short time of using the AMI software, it was discovered that all units receiving intakes from AMI would have to use the automated CIDSS--

- for caseworkers to get the new intake reports and

- for supervisors to track case assignments and status (by means of the management information reports that AMI/CIDSS software can provide).

The discovery (that CIDSS would have to operate in all seven units) significantly disrupted the original implementation plan. Shortage of hardware and inexperience with the software precluded full implementation; instead, the project had to improvise.

1.4.3 Resolving Problems

CPS state office staff resolved the problem by devising a way for two units to make full use of CIDSS while other units used CIDSS in a limited manner. The two units documented all investigation cases on CIDSS, thus creating the electronic management reports as a by-product of case documentation. The other units used CIDSS only to update certain information on the management reports. This procedure remained the rule for the rest of the implementation stage.

In September 1986, CPS state office staff met with pilot staff to identify software problems and to specify changes needed. Although state office staff felt that they were not able to give CIDSS as thorough a test as desired, they felt they learned enough from the pilot to redesign the system to meet the pilot staff's needs. This assessment and redesign stage is consistent with the prototyping methodology. (Appendix F lists the problems and specifications that were submitted to programming staff. Modifications are being made on CIDSS to reflect the changes suggested.)

2. METHODS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 2 discusses (1) the population and sample in terms of their adequacy to answer the research questions and (2) the research design and research questions.

2.2 POPULATION AND SAMPLE

Sample selection was constrained by the fact that in order for the automated CIDSS to function, an electronic transfer of case data from the Automated MAPPER Intake (AMI) System was required. AMI was only in use in the Fort Worth and Arlington areas of DHS Region 5. As a result, the pilot test was carried out in these areas.

The original implementation design was for CIDSS to be used in all seven of Region 5's CPS units. However, problems encountered in the implementation process severely limited the number of staff who could use the system fully. (These problems were discussed in subsections 1.4.2 and 1.4.3).

All seven CPS units did have some experience with using the automated CIDSS, but there were three different levels of experience and involvement among these units.

- The first level of involvement consisted of five units that used the automated CIDSS only for receiving new intakes from AMI. These units performed no documentation on the automated CIDSS.

- The second level of involvement consisted of two workers in the sixth unit who documented their investigations using the manual CIDSS workbook. However, actual entry of the data into the automated CIDSS was performed by a data entry clerk.

- The third level of involvement consisted of four workers in the seventh unit who were designated for full testing of the automated CIDSS software.

The pilot sites represent mainly urban and suburban settings that are not necessarily representative of CPS offices in Texas. The stated purpose of the pilot was to refine and field test the software system, not to test its application statewide. Therefore, the project managers felt that the purpose of the pilot could be served without a representative sample of units or specialists.

2.3 EVALUATION RESEARCH DESIGN

The evaluation of the automated CIDSS pilot test was designed to answer the following general questions--

- How do workers respond to use of the automated CIDSS?

- How does the automated CIDSS influence CPS work load?

- What types of training and support are necessary to support introduction and use of the automated CIDSS?

The original evaluation plan was based on the assumption that all CPS units would use the automated CIDSS fully and equally. Going by that assumption, the evaluation was carried out with all seven units. As discussed previously, the implementation plan ran into significant problems that had to be resolved. As a result, the implementation plan no longer proceeded as the evaluation plan had envisioned.

Evaluation Strategy: Questionnaires. The evaluation was designed to operate as a management feedback system to assist in diagnosing and addressing implementation problems. One strategy to investigate how effectively the system operated was to administer questionnaires and surveys to CPS case specialists and supervisors. A series of attitude surveys (Appendix G) asked staff about their experience with CIDSS, their reactions to standardization of case investigation record keeping, and their opinion on aspects of CIDSS and their jobs. Another type of questionnaire, the Implementation Factors Survey (Appendix H), offered a simple procedure for anticipating implementation problems and monitoring their resolution.

Evaluation Strategy--Individual and Group Discussions. A second strategy consisted of regularly scheduled meetings to gain information for system evaluation and problem resolution. Informal contacts and group discussions were organized around complaints and problems.

Constraints. The first strategy (questionnaires) was constrained to a very small sample (two supervisors and four specialists). Not only was the sample size small, but it was impossible to determine which level of software each respondent had used.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The automated CIDSS consists of three features--

- o automated case reading,
- o automation of case management tasks, and
- o automated management information reporting.

The evaluation examined (among other questions) which feature of the system was most valuable.

During the first three months of the pilot test, field staff generally reacted negatively to the first two features but felt the third feature could be useful to them. When the pilot was evaluated in September 1986, state office and regional staff decided to focus available resources primarily on further testing and development of the management information aspect of CIDSS, which regional staff felt had proven to have greater value than the case documentation aspect of the system.

3.2 CPS SPECIALIST AND SUPERVISOR COMMENTS

The CPS specialists' reactions to CIDSS were--

- o There was not enough access to terminals when the specialists had time available to perform case documentation.

- There was a general feeling that more training and follow-up during the initial learning process would have helped the specialists use CIDSS more effectively.

- CIDSS was too slow and cumbersome; other methods of case documentation, such as using a dictaphone, were more effective.

CPS supervisor reactions to CIDSS were--

- CIDSS is not an effective use of the specialists' time. Their main function is face-to-face contact with clients, not data entry.

- Supervisors agreed that additional training and follow-up support were necessary during the initial stages of learning.

- Supervisors agreed that automated support for case assignment and case management was needed. However, they also felt that those features of CIDSS did not fully meet their needs and expectations in reality.

3.3 TRAINING

Evaluation of training indicated that it was in-sufficient to prepare CPS specialists and supervisors to use CIDSS fully. The majority of respondents reported that, while training material was adequate, additional material, such as a software user's guide, would have enhanced the learning process greatly. Field staff also felt that, in order to learn CIDSS

fully, they should have been relieved of their existing work load so that they could concentrate on learning the system. Field staff also felt that trainers should be on-site for the first few weeks of operation to continue individualized training sessions.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the Case Decision Project was to design a system that would assist CPS staff in the investigation of child abuse referrals. From the findings of the pilot site evaluation, the following conclusions can be drawn regarding the degree to which the following objectives were achieved.

1. Standardize recording of case investigations. CIDSS Project staff developed the CIDSS workbook as a standard method of recording case investigations. The workbook is described and evaluated (favorably, on balance) in Part I of this report.

2. Support the collection (recording), analysis, and use of information pertinent to the decision to open or close a case. The primary need of field staff was to have an effective automated management information system (MIS). The first tier of automated systems development should be the installation of a MIS to meet basic information needs. The second tier is usually a decision support system, which analyzes and configures data from the management information system to support a range of management decisions.

The CIDSS software was an attempt to provide a third tier of automation--decision support to worker staff, i.e., a system for collecting and analyzing detailed client circumstances to support decisions on individual cases. Based upon the results of the surveys, questionnaires, and com-

ments from state office and field staff, project staff concluded that the software was too advanced for a work environment that lacked experience with the first two "tiers" of automation.

3. Automated certain case management tasks. Staff felt that the automation of case management tasks was not flexible enough to prove useful to them. Tasks that CIDSS required the supervisor to perform were in practice being performed or documented at times by clerical or worker staff. They also expressed a need for the system to allow the documentation of the task to take place at a later time than its performance. For example, a supervisor might need to assign a case to a worker verbally in an emergency, when use of the computer would be impractical. The flexibility needed by staff has been included in the redesign of CIDSS.

4. Provide automated management information reporting. Field staff reacted much more positively to this aspect of the software. They recognized the value of automated management information in their day-to-day operations. The management support aspect of CIDSS focused upon the limited range of operations within the scope of the project, and it was not initially intended to provide support for the full range of intake/investigation management needs. Experience with the management information aspect of CIDSS led supervisors very quickly to recognize its potential benefits, despite the limitations of CIDSS in this regard. In their evaluation of CIDSS, supervisors expressed their need for man-

agement information, and CIDSS is now being redesigned to provide a broader range of management information on intake and investigation.

APPENDIXES

A. Evaluation Surveys (CIDSS Workbook Evaluation)

B. Implementation Factors Inventory--
CIDDS Workbook Evaluation

C. CPS Automated Systems

D. RIF/RAF Model

E. Material Used in Developing Conceptual Design

F. Status Report on the Automated CIDSS

G. Questionnaires for Evaluation of CIDSS Automated System

H. Implementation Factors Survey for Evaluation of Automated CIDSS

APPENDIX A

Evaluation Surveys
(CIDSS Workbook Evaluation)

CONTENTS

Attitude Survey, Cover Memo A-2

Attitude Survey A-2

Evaluation Survey I, Cover Information A-10

Evaluation Survey I A-12

Final Evaluation Survey, Cover Memo A-36

Final Evaluation Survey, Follow-Up Cover Memo A-38

Final Evaluation Survey A-40

MEMORANDUM

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

SUBJECT: Attitude Survey: Pretest of Case Investigation Protocol

TO:

FROM:

John Theiss
Research Design Specialist

Jeffrey Anderson
Research Specialist
Organization Development Division
State Office 503-E

DATE: October 10, 1985

As you may have heard, your unit is one of twelve that will participate in pretesting a new process of recording Child Welfare case investigations. This process is based on a Case Investigation Support System (CISS) workbook. This workbook will replace current case recording procedures for up to four months, November through February.

We need your opinions and expectations concerning use of the workbook. Your responses to the enclosed survey will help us to evaluate the CISS workbook and our efforts to manage the pretest. The survey takes about ten minutes to complete.

All responses to the survey will be kept confidential. To assure the confidentiality of your survey, do not write your name on the survey form. Instead, please check that your name and mail code appear on the cover sheet. We need the cover sheet to be able to tell if each of the workers returned surveys. It will be removed from the survey when it is returned. In other words, John will recieve the survey. He will remove and throw out the coversheet with you name. Your name will not appear on the survey or with the responses stored in the computer.

Please complete and return the survey as soon as possible. This survey is an important source of information about your opinions and expectations concerning the CISS. Please contact us [(512) 450-3696 STS 887-3696 or 3697] if you have any questions or if you would like a summary of the results when they become available next fall.

Jeffrey M Anderson

Jeffrey M. Anderson

John Theiss

JMA:JT:nel

Attachment

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

CASE INVESTIGATION SUPPORT SYSTEM

ATTITUDE SURVEY

Office of Research

Demonstration & Evaluation

CASE INVESTIGATION SUPPORT SYSTEM

ATTITUDE SURVEY

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Please answer every question. If you like, you may discuss items in the comment section.

- We want to know your honest opinions. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire.

- Most of the questions ask that you circle one of several numbers that appear on a scale beside the item. You are to choose the one number that best matches the description of how you feel about the item.

- Please read each question carefully. The scale descriptions are different in different parts of the questionnaire.

- To return survey please fold in half with return address showing and staple closed.

Thank you for your help.

Please answer each of the questions below by circling the number next to the description which best fits you.

1. Are you: 1. Female 2. Male

2. Approximately how many years have you;

worked with DHR?	worked with CPS?
1. less than 1 year	1. less than 1 year
2. 1 to less than 2	2. 1 to less than 2
3. 2 to less than 3	3. 2 to less than 3
4. 3 to less than 5	4. 3 to less than 5
5. 5 to less than 7	5. 5 to less than 7
6. 7 to less than 9	6. 7 to less than 9
7. 9 or more years	7. 9 or more years

3. Which of the following best describes you current position?

1. Worker 2. Supervisor

4. Do you think that the use of a standardized investigation guide is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

1 Definitely NO
2 Probably NO
3 Not Sure
4 Probably YES
5 Definitely YES

COPIED AT STATE EXPENSE

5. Here are some words and phrases which can be used to describe you present job. Circle the number on each line that describes how you see your job. For example, if you think you job is very "boring" circle number 1, right next to the word "boring." If you think your job is very "interesting," circle number 7, right next to the word "interesting." If you think it is somewhere in between, circle a number between 1 and 7.

Circle the number that best describes your job.
Be sure to circle a number on each line.

Boring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . Interesting
Enjoyable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . Miserable
Useless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . Worthwhile
Friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . Lonely
Full	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . Empty
Discouraging	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . Hopeful
Rewarding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . Disappointing
Brings Out The Best In Me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Doesn't Give Me . . . . . A Chance

6. We are interested in learning how you think the use of a standardized investigation guide will change your job and the work you do. A number of possible changes are listed below. Please indicate your level of agreement of disagreement with each statement by checking the appropriate numbered box on the seven point scale.

1. Increase my workload	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Increase the freedom I have on my job . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Improve the quality of work I produce . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Make it more difficult to meet deadlines .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Make it difficult to do a good job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Make my work more challenging	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Make my work more frustrating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Decrease the discretion I exercise on my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Increase my ability to get work done . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Make it easier to keep up with my workload	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Make my job more interesting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. Are you familiar with the Case Investigation Workbook?
[1] NO
YES
[2] My knowledge is minimal, but I am aware of the workbooks.
[3] I have heard about and/or discussed the workbooks.
[4] I have seen drafts of the workbooks.

This Completes the questionnaire, we would appreciate any comments you would like to make, please write them in the space below. When you have finished, please fold in half with return address showing and staple closed.

COMMENTS:

COPIED AT STATE EXPENSE

Evaluation Survey I was designed to evaluate the pilot test training. It also collected opinion and attitude information after the pilot test staff had been introduced to the workbook and received training, but before they had field experience with it. This additional opinion and attitude information was collected for three reasons.

First, trainee responses could be used to identify problems before the workbook was in use. The comparing post training results with baseline results can be used to show changes in opinions and attitudes from pre pilot to after training. Identifying changes in opinions and attitudes at this point was intended to avoid complications that might result from reactions to the workbook content or organization.

Second, if the training was evaluated as being less than adequate, the opinion and attitude responses (especially in contract to pre-training responses) could help identify training weaknesses and staff needs to properly implement the pilot.

Third, collecting opinion and attitude information after training provided an opportunity to identify changes over the course of the pilot instead of only before and after it. Therefore, if there were problems, the evaluation had the potential for identifying whether the changes were due to the workbook and the model and/or their use.

Evaluation Survey I was completed by trainees immediately after training at the three sites, Houston, Edinburg and Victoria.

CASE INVESTIGATION SUPPORT SYSTEM

EVALUATION SURVEY I

Office of Research

Demonstration & Evaluation

COPIED AT STATE EXPENSE

Name _____ Mail Code _____

To insure Confidentiality, this page will be torn off & discarded by ORDE.

CASE INVESTIGATION SUPPORT SYSTEM

EVALUATION SURVEY I

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Please answer every question. If you like, you may discuss items in the comment section.

- We want to know your honest opinions. Please do not put your name in the questionnaire.

Thank you for your help.

1. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Two weeks ago you expressed some opinions concerning your expectations about the CISS workbook. The following questions will tell us how the training affected your expectations. Circle the number of the statement that best describes your opinions.

1. The CISS Workbook is:

   1 much better than I expected
   2 somewhat better than I expected
   3 about what I expected
   4 somewhat worse than I expected
   5 much worse than I expected

2. Do you think that this Workbook is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

   1 Definitely NO
   2 Probably NO
   3 Not Sure
   4 Probably YES
   5 Definitely YES

3. Now that you are familiar with the CISS Workbook, how do you think the workbook will change your job and the work you do? A number of possible changes are listed below. Please indicate your level of agreement of disagreement with each statement by checking the appropriate number on the seven point scale.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Increase my workload	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Increase the freedom I have on my job . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Improve the quality of work I produce . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Make it more difficult to meet deadlines .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Make it difficult to do a good job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Make my work more challenging	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Make my work more frustrating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Decrease the discretion I exercise on my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Increase my ability to get work done . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Make it easier to keep up with my workload	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Make my job more interesting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

COPIED AT STATE EXPENSE

II. SPECIFIC CONCERNS

Please make at least one positive and one negative statement or observation about the CISS idea, the workbook, and/or the way it is being implemented.

Positive:

Negative:

COPIED AT STATE EXPENSE

III. TRIAL EXERCISE:

The 2 paragraphs below include information from an intake and an initial investigation contact. Please read this information and enter it in the appropriate places in the attached workbook.

On March 7, 1985 you were assigned the following Priority I abuse investigation. Pete S. arrived at school severely bruised with blackened eyes and a bloody ear. The school nurse alleges that Mr. Riser abused Pete. The intake report contained Mr. Riser's work phone number and you called him immediately.

Mr. Riser reported that he was only trying to teach his step-son, Pete, the importance of success in academic and sports activities. He said that he expects his son to excel in everything and punishes him severely when he does not. He repeatedly emphasized that he does not hit Pete and therefore does not abuse him.

Beginning with the Allegations section, please enter this initial investigation information in the attached Workbook.

CASE INVESTIGATION SUPPORT SYSTEM WORKBOOK

CASE: Pete S.	WORKER: You	DATE ASSIGNED: March 7, 1985

[ ] PRIORITY I

Oral notification of law enforcement within 24 hrs? X YES __NO
Written report sent to law enforcement within 5 calendar days? X YES __NO
Supervisor contacted for approval within 24 hrs? X YES __NO
Investigation initiated within 24 hrs? X YES __NO

[ ] PRIORITY II: SEXUAL ABUSE

Oral notification of law enforcement within 24 hrs? __YES __NO
Written report sent to law enforcement within 5 calendar days? __YES __NO
Investigation initiated within 10 calendar days? __YES __NO

[ ] PRIORITY II

Oral or written notification of law enforcement within 3 calendar days? __YES __NO
Investigation initiated within 10 calendar days? __YES __NO

[ ] PRIORITY III

COMMENTS: _____

_____

FAMILY CONSTELLATION

NAME	AGE	SEX	REL
S. Riser	37	M	SF
M. Riser	28	F	MO
Pete Smith	11	M	OV

NAME	AGE	SEX	REL

ALLEGATIONS

TYPE	CHILDREN	DESCRIPTION OF ALLEGATIONS

OTHER SIGNIFICANT INFORMATION

RECORD OF CONTACTS

DATE	(Type of contact)	(Persons contacted)	(Pertinent observations)

RECORD OF CONTACTS

DATE	(Type of contact)	(Persons contacted)	(Pertinent observations)

NAME & AGE : : : : : :

CHILD(REN) SEEN BY WORKER?	Y	N
NO PROBLEMS NOTED		
PREVIOUS ABUSE/NEGLECT		
PSYCHOLOGICAL/EMOT CONDITION		
Normal psych/emot condition		
Diagnosed mentally retarded		
Diagnosed psycholog problem		
Ltd. intellectual ability		
Anxious/fearful		
Withdrawn/depressed		
Hostile/aggressive		
Suicide tendencies		
Other		
BEHAVIOR PATTERN		
Normal behavior		
Hyperactive		
Substance abuse		
Physically assaults others		
Sexual acting-out		
School problems		
Delinquent behavior		
Defiant/provoking behavior		
Disturbed/unusual behavior		
Other		
DEVELOPMENTAL CONDITION		
Normal development		
Below normal weight/height		
Delayed speech/motor		
Delayed social development		
Other		
PHYSICAL CONDITION/HISTORY		
Good physical condition		
Premature/low birth-weight		
Serious illness/injury		
Disability		
Poor hygiene		
Failure to thrive		
Malnutrition		
Skin rash/disorder		
Other		
PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIP		
Normal interaction		
Bonding/attach. disruption		
Role reversal		
Lack of nurture/stimulation		
Child afraid of parent		
Child unwanted		
Child scapegoated		
Child perceived negatively		
Other		

___No injuries noted.

TYPE	LOCATION: BUTT	TRSO	EXTR	HEAD	GNTL	DESCRIPTION OF INJURIES
BONE						
BRAI						
BRUI						
BURN						
CONC						
DISL						
DISM						
EXPO						
HEMA						
HEMR						
INTL						
POIS						
SCAL						
SENS						
SEXL						
SKUL						
SPRA						
SUFF						
WELT						
WOUN						
OTHR						

INJURIES OF MULTIPLE AGES? ___Yes ___No

PICTURES TAKEN? ___Yes ___No

ALLEG	AFF	ASM	EXPLANATION OF ALLEGATIONS
ABAN			
ABUS			
EDUC			
EMOA			
EMON			
MEDI			
PHYS			
SEXL			
SUPE			
OTHR			

DEGREE OF AFFIRMATION
1--Affirms abuse/neglect
2--Partially affirms abuse/neglect
3--Denies abuse/neglect
4--No explanation

ASSESSMENT OF EXPLANATION
1--Explanation consistent with other facts
2--Explanation possible, but unlikely
3--Explanation inconsist. with other facts
4--Unknown

ADULT(S) ' '(S):

ACCESS TO CHILD
Full-time
Part-time
Infrequent
None

INDIVIDU CHARACTERISTICS
o problems noted
Psychologic l/emot. problems
Limited intellectual ability
Lack of impulse control
Low self-esteem
Suicide tendencies
Substance abuse
Problems with the law
History of physical assault
History of sexual assault
Other

PARENTING FACTORS
Good parenting skills
Limited parenting skills
Unreal. expect. of children
Inappropriate discipline
Other

RELATIONSHIP FACTORS
Healthy/supportive relat
Marital/paramour problems
Sexual dysfunction
Other

STRESS FACTORS
Financial problems
Employment problems
Health problems/disability
Recent divorce/separation
Other

VICTIMIZATION HISTORY
No victimization history
Abused/r glected as child
Sexual abused as child
Abused spouse/paramour
Other

CIAL ISOLATION
No isolation
Some isolation
vere isolation

[TION TO WORKER
Cooperative
Uncooperative
H le/threatening
Other

PAST ABUS GLECT OF CHILD

All allegations explained to parent/caretaker? ___YES ___NO

ALLEG	AFF	ASM	EXPLANATION OF ALLEGATIONS
ABAN			
ABUS			
EDUC			
EMOA			
EMON			
MEDI			
PHYS			
SEXL			
SUPE			
OTHR			

DEGREE OF AFFIRMATION

1--Affirms abuse/neglect
2--Partially affirms abuse/neglect
3--Denies abuse/neglect
4--No explanation

ASSESSMENT OF EXPLANATION

1--Explanation consistent with other facts
2--Explanation possible, but unlikely
3--Explanation inconsist. with other facts
4--Unknown

ASSESSMENT OF HOME ENVIRONMENT

Home visit made? ___YES ___NO. DATE:_____

Home environment adequate to protect child(ren)? ___YES ___NO

FINDINGS OF INVESTIGATION: Disposition of Allegations

TYPE	CHILD(REN)	DISPOS	EXTENT	ALLEGED PERPETRATOR(S)	REASONS FOR DISPOSITION / CAUSE OF ABUSE/NEGLECT
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		
			1 2 3 4 5		

ASSESSMENT OF RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

FAMILY ABILITY TO PROTECT CHILD(REN):

_____: is/are able to protect child(ren) on own.
_____: will monitor situation to protect child(ren)
_____: will work with CPS to protect child(ren).
_____: is/are unable to protect child(ren).
_____: see(s) no need to protect child(ren).
_____: is/are unwilling to protect child(ren).
_____: Other:_____.

COMMENTS:_____

COMMUNITY RESOURCES USED/NEEDED TO PROTECT CHILD(REN):

CASE DECISION

DHS ACTION NEEDED TO PROTECT CHILD(REN):

____NONE: Close case ____OPEN: In-home services ____OPEN: Remove child(ren)

WORKER COMMENTS: _____

Date results of investigation explained to Parents/Caretakers: _____
Alleged victim(s): _____ Complainant: _____

WORKER SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

SUPERVISOR REVIEW:

Supervisor ____CONCURS ____DOES NOT CONCUR with worker's recommendation.

SUPERVISOR COMMENTS: _____

SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS REFERRALS

REFERRAL NO.		DATE OF REFERRAL:	DATE CASE CLOSED:
REFERRAL TYPE		EXTENT OF CASEWORK	COMMENTS
__ABAN	__MEDI	__Closed at intake	
__ABUS	__PHYS	__In-home services	
__EDUC	__SEXL	__Child removal	
__EMOA	__SUPE	__Family moved	
__EMON	__OTHR	__Other	

REFERRAL NO.		DATE OF REFERRAL:	DATE CASE CLOSED:
REFERRAL TYPE		EXTENT OF CASEWORK	COMMENTS
__ABAN	__MEDI	__Closed at intake	
__ABUS	__PHYS	__In-home services	
__EDUC	__SEXL	__Child removal	
__EMOA	__SUPE	__Family moved	
__EMON	__OTHR	__Other	

REFERRAL NO.		DATE OF REFERRAL	DATE CASE CLOSED
REFERRAL TYPE		EXTENT OF CASEWORK	COMMENTS
__ABAN	__MEDI	__Closed at intake	
__ABUS	__PHYS	__In-home services	
__EDUC	__SEXL	__Child removal	
__EMOA	__SUPE	__Family moved	
__EMON	__OTHR	__Other	

REFERRAL NO.		DATE OF REFERRAL	DATE CASE CLOSED
REFERRAL TYPE		EXTENT OF CASEWORK	COMMENTS
__ABAN	__MEDI	__Closed at intake	
__ABUS	__PHYS	__In-home services	
__EDUC	__SEXL	__Child removal	
__EMOA	__SUPE	__Family moved	
__EMON	__OTHR	__Other	

REFERRAL NO.		DATE OF REFERRAL	DATE CASE CLOSED
REFERRAL TYPE		EXTENT OF CASEWORK	COMMENTS
__ABAN	__MEDI	__Closed at intake	
__ABUS	__PHYS	__In-home services	
__EDUC	__SEXL	__Child removal	
__EMOA	__SUPE	__Family moved	
__EMON	__OTHR	__Other	

IV. MATCHING THE MODEL AND THE WORKBOOK

The CISS system is based on the investigation model presented this morning. The workbook was planned to correspond to the model. Several major sections of the model and the workbook are listed below. Please put an 'X' in every box that represents a match.

Workbook Sections

Model	Allegations	Evaluation of Children	Description of Injuries	Explaination of Allegation (adult)	Assessment of Resource Availability	Community Resources Used/Needed	Supervisor Review
EVENT: What happened							
EXTENT: How serious							
DYNAMICS: Environment							

V. TRAINING FEEDBACK SECTION

1. Instructor demonstrated a genuine interest in this material.

Definitely Yes	Yes	Neutral	No	Definitely No
1	2	3	4	5

2. Instructor presented the material coherently, emphasizing major points and making relationships clear.

Definitely Yes	Yes	Neutral	No	Definitely No
1	2	3	4	5

3. What part(s) or the workshop will be **most** helpful to you in doing your job?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. What part(s) of the workshop will be **least** helpful in doing your job?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. What suggestions do you have for improving this workshop?

_____

_____

_____

_____

This Completes the questionnaire, we would appreciate any comments you would like to make, please write them in the space below. When you have finished, please fold in half with return address showing and staple closed.

COMMENTS:

MEMORANDUM

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

SUBJECT: Final Evaluation Survey: Pilot Test of Case Investigation Workbook

TO:
See Distribution List

FROM:
John Theiss
Research Design Specialist
Technical Resources Section
Organization Development Division
State Office, 503-E

DATE: March 3, 1986

The formal pretest of the CIDSS workbook ended February 28th. Attached is a Final Evaluation Survey. It contains questions concerning your current work situation and your opinions of the workbook. This survey, and earlier surveys, interviews and discussions will be used to evaluate the workbook and our training and coordination of the pilot test. A summary of the findings will be distributed to each of you by July.

The survey takes about 20 minutes to complete. Please complete and return the survey as soon as possible. Please contact me [(512) 450-3697 STS 887-3697] if you have any questions.

All responses to the survey will be kept confidential. To assure the confidentiality of your survey, do not write your name on the survey form. Instead, please check that your name and mail code are highlighted on the distribution list. We need the distribution list to be able to tell who returned surveys. The list will be removed from the survey when it is returned. In other words, I will remove and throw out the distribution list with your name. Your name will not appear on the survey or with the responses stored in the computer.

John Theiss

JTT:ctv

Attachment

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

MEMORANDUM

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

SUBJECT: Final Evaluation Survey: Pilot Test of Case Investigation Workbook

TO: See Distribution List

FROM: John Theiss
Research Design Specialist
Technical Resources Section
Organization Development Division
State Office, 503-E

DATE: April 1, 1986

On March I sent out a final evaluation survey. You have either:
not returned your survey,
or
returned your survey without the distribution list.

If you have not completed and returned your survey, please complete and return the attached survey.

If you completed and returned your survey but removed the distribution sheet please fold and return this distribution sheet. My address is on the reverse.

Thank you,

John Theiss

JTT:ctv

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

CASE INVESTIGATION SUPPORT SYSTEM

FINAL EVALUATION

Office of Research

Demonstration & Evaluation

CASE INVESTIGATION SUPPORT SYSTEM

FINAL EVALUATION

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Please answer every question. You may discuss items in the comment section. We are especially interested in your comments because they frequently tell us how to avoid or solve problems we had not anticipated.

- We want to know your honest opinions. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire.

- Most of the questions ask that you circle one of several numbers that appear on a scale beside the item. You are to choose the one number that best matches the description of how you feel about the item.

- Please read each question carefully. The scale descriptions are different in different parts of the questionnaire.

- To return survey please fold in half with return address showing and staple closed.

Thank you for your help.

Please answer the questions below by circling the number of the description which best fits you.

1. Did you attend workbook training at: 1. Harlingen 2. Victoria 3. Houston

   Other:_____

2. Approximately how many years have you worked with CPS?

   1. less than 1 year
   2. 1 to less than 3
   3. 3 to less than 5
   4. 5 to less than 7
   5. 7 to less than 9
   6. 9 or more years

3. Which of the following best describes your current position?

   1. Worker
   2. Supervisor

4. What percent of your workload involves case investigations?

   1. 75%, or more
   2. 50% to 75%
   3. 25% to 50%
   4. less than 25%

5. Here are some words and phrases which can be used to describe you present job. Circle the number on each line that describes how you see your job. For example, if you think you job is very "boring" circle number 1, right next to the word "boring." If you think your job is very "interesting," circle number 7, right next to the word "interesting." If you think it is somewhere in between, circle a number between 1 and 7.

   Circle the number that best describes your job.
   Be sure to circle a number on each line.

Boring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . .Interesting
Enjoyable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . .Miserable
Useless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . Worthwhile
Friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . Lonely
Full	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . .Empty
Discouraging	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . .Hopeful
Rewarding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . .Disappointing
Brings Out The Best In Me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Doesn't Give Me . . . . . A Chance

6a. About how many weeks did it take for you to become familiar with the CIDSS workbook format?

_____ weeks

b. About how many weeks did it take before you felt comfortable and proficient in using the CIDSS workbook?

_____ weeks

7. Do you think that the use of a standardized investigation guide is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

1 Definitely NO
2 Probably NO
3 Not Sure
4 Probably YES
5 Definitely YES

8. Do you think that the CIDSS workbook you have been pilot testing is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

1 Definitely NO
2 Probably NO
3 Not Sure
4 Probably YES
5 Definitely YES

9. We are interested in learning how the CIDSS investigation guide has changed your job and the work you do. A number of possible changes are listed below. Please indicate your level of agreement of disagreement with each statement by checking the appropriate numbered box on the seven point scale.

	DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE	DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	AGREE SOMEWHAT	AGREE	AGREE STRONGLY
1. Increased my workload	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Increased the freedom I have on my job . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Improved the quality of work I produce . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Made it more difficult to meet deadlines . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Made it difficult to do a good job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Made my work more challenging	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Made my work more frustrating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Decreased the discretion I exercise on my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Increased my ability to get work done . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Made it easier to keep up with my workload .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Made my job more interesting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Improved the documentation in case records .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Increased time to complete documentation . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. If it was entirely your choice would you continue to use the CIDSS workbook?

1 Definitely NO
2 Probably NO
3 Not Sure
4 Probably YES
5 Definitely YES

11. We have heard many comments regarding pilot staff's expectations of and experience in using the CIDSS workbook. We have summarized groups of these comments into general statements. Please circle the number that best represents your reaction to the following general statements.

	DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE	DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	AGREE SOMEWHAT	AGREE	AGREE STRONGLY
The workbook makes it easier to meet program standards.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A workbook case record is less clear than a record before the Pilot Test.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The workbook is especially good for:							
Recording **quickie** cases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recording **complex** cases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recording **typical** cases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The workbook record makes it hard to really understand the case.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I refer to the workbokk as I do the investigation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I fill out the workbook after the investigation is substantially completed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I write less when I use the workbook.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Since using the workbook I find that I make fewer contacts to complete a case.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. One of the most important uses of a pilot test is the opportunity for hindsight. Please list below some things you feel that we could have done better.

We are especially interested in:

a. What additional information, support or training would have been helpful?

b. How would you change the workbook? Why?

c. Any other comments you have. / [illegible] you need more space. Whe [illegible]
finished, please fold in half w [illegible] address showing and staple [illegible]

COMMENTS

c. Any other comments you have. Add page if you need more space. When you have finished, please fold in half with return address showing and staple closed.

COPIED AT STATE EXPENSE

COMMENTS

12. One of the most important uses of a pilot test is the opportunity for hindsight. Please list below some things you feel that we could have done better.

We are especially interested in:

a. What additional information, support or training would have been helpful?

COPIED AT STATE EXPENSE

b. How would you change the workbook? Why?

10. If it was entirely your choice would you continue to use the CIDSS workbook?

1 Definitely NO
2 Probably NO
3 Not Sure
4 Probably YES
5 Definitely YES

11. We have heard many comments regarding pilot staff's expectations of and experience in using the CIDSS workbook. We have summarized groups of these comments into general statements. Please circle the number that best represents your reaction to the following general statements.

	DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE	DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	AGREE SOMEWHAT	AGREE	AGREE STRONGLY
The workbook makes it easier to meet program standards.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A workbook case record is less clear than a record before the Pilot Test.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The workbook is especially good for:							
Recording **quickie** cases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recording **complex** cases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recording **typical** cases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The workbook record makes it hard to really understand the case.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I refer to the workbokk as I do the investigation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I fill out the workbook after the investigation is substantially completed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I write less when I use the workbook.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Since using the workbook I find that I make fewer contacts to complete a case.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

COPY AT STATE EXPENSE

6a. About how many weeks did it take for you to become familiar with the CIDSS workbook format?

_____ weeks

b. About how many weeks did it take before you felt comfortable and proficient in using the CIDSS workbook?

_____ weeks

7. Do you think that the use of a standardized investigation guide is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

1 Definitely NO
2 Probably NO
3 Not Sure
4 Probably YES
5 Definitely YES

8. Do you think that the CIDSS workbook you have been pilot testing is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

1 Definitely NO
2 Probably NO
3 Not Sure
4 Probably YES
5 Definitely YES

9. We are interested in learning how the CIDSS investigation guide has changed your job and the work you do. A number of possible changes are listed below. Please indicate your level of agreement of disagreement with each statement by checking the appropriate numbered box on the seven point scale.

	DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE	DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	AGREE SOMEWHAT	AGREE	AGREE STRONGLY
1. Increased my workload	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Increased the freedom I have on my job . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Improved the quality of work I produce . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Made it more difficult to meet deadlines . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Made it difficult to do a good job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Made my work more challenging	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Made my work more frustrating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Decreased the discretion I exercise on my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Increased my ability to get work done . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Made it easier to keep up with my workload .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Made my job more interesting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Improved the documentation in case records .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Increased time to complete documentation . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

COPIED AT STATE EXPENSE

Please answer the questions below by circling the number of the description which best fits you.

1. Did you attend workbook training at: 1. Harlingen 2. Victoria 3. Houston

   Other:_____

2. Approximately how many years have you worked with CPS?

   1. less than 1 year
   2. 1 to less than 3
   3. 3 to less than 5
   4. 5 to less than 7
   5. 7 to less than 9
   6. 9 or more years

3. Which of the following best describes your current position?

   1. Worker
   2. Supervisor

4. What percent of your workload involves case investigations?

   1. 75%, or more
   2. 50% to 75%
   3. 25% to 50%
   4. less than 25%

5. Here are some words and phrases which can be used to describe you present job. Circle the number on each line that describes how you see your job. For example, if you think you job is very "boring" circle number 1, right next to the word "boring." If you think your job is very "interesting," circle number 7, right next to the word "interesting." If you think it is somewhere in between, circle a number between 1 and 7.

   Circle the number that best describes your job.
   Be sure to circle a number on each line.

Boring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . .Interesting
Enjoyable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . .Miserable
Useless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . Worthwhile
Friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . Lonely
Full	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . .Empty
Discouraging	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . . .Hopeful
Rewarding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	. . . . .Disappointing
Brings Out The Best In Me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Doesn't Give Me . . . . . A Chance

COPIED AT STATE EXPENSE

APPENDIX B

Implementation Factors Inventory--
CIDSS Workbook Evaluation

CONTENTS

Description of Inventory B-2

Flow Chart of Process of Planned Change B-4

Project Monitoring Implementation Factors Questionnaire B-6

Project Monitoring Implementation Factors

The Innovation Acceptance Inventory is a simple procedure for anticipating implementation problems and monitoring problem resolution. It recognizes that there are two sources of implementation problems. Problems can arise because of imperfections in the innovation--changes may be needed to make it more useful or easier to use. There are 12 items on the Innovation Acceptance Inventory which probe for information about possible problems with the innovation. Problems also can arise because of the users--they may need additional support or encouragement to help them accept the innovation. There are 12 items on the Innovation Acceptance Inventory which probe for information about user acceptance.

By completing the inventory in advance of actual project implementation and completing it periodically throughout the implementation phase, a project manager can anticipate problems and know when they have been resolved. The inventory is also a valuable tool for locating implementation leverage--i.e. identifying features of the innovation or characteristics of the users that can be promoted to foster successful implementation.

Attached is a copy of the Innovation Acceptance Inventory (tailored for the current project) and a figure showing where it fits into the CIW portion of the Case Decision project. The figure shows that the inventory stands between actual implementing actions on the part of workbook users and implementation support activities managed by the Project Director. As is suggested in the figure, the Innovation Acceptance Inventory can help to forge a strong link between goal identification and goal attainment.

The Innovation Acceptance inventory will also be used to monitor the implementation of the Automation Pilot.

More detailed information concerning the design of and research basis for the Inventory may be found in the following journal articles or by telephoning Cynthia Roberts-Gray at (512)450-3749:

Roberts-Gray, C. & Gray, T. (1983). Implementing innovations: A model to bridge the gap between diffusion and utilization. Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 5, 213-232.

Roberts-Gray, C. (1985). Managing the implementation of innovations. Evaluation and Program Planning, 8, 00-00.

THE PROCESS OF PLANNED CHANGE



PROJECT MONITORING

IMPLEMENTATION FAÇTORS

Office of Research

Demonstration & Evaluation

Name_____
(optional)

Site of Training (circle one)

Houston
Edinberg
Victoria

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Please answer every question. If you like, you may discuss items in the comment section.

- Most of the questions ask that you check one of several numbers that appear on a scale beside the item. You are to choose the one number that best matches the description of how you feel about the item. Items coded in the gray area require comments. Please use the comment format presented in the examples.

- The questions refer to information or issues related to your organizational unit and codes should be marked only for your unit. Of course comments may be made concerning any information and issues that might affect the Pilot Test.

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING

I. INNOVATION FACTORS

Numerous factors affect the success of an innovation. The twelve factors listed below are often linked with successful projects. AT THIS POINT IN TIME, HOW ACCURATELY DO THESE STATEMENTS DESCRIBE THE CASE INVESTIGATION PROJECT?

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling the appropriate number on the seven point scale.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	Expected benefits, cost, and procedures for using the workbook are clear.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
2.	Procedures for getting, completing, using, and storing the workbook are simple.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
3.	The workbook configurtion is stable—i.e. it's content, format, and procedures will not have to change much over time.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
4.	There is a strong need for the workbook at this site.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
5.	Beyond meeting the need, the workbookhas obvious advantages for this unit.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
6.	The effectiveness of the workbook is readily observable.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
7.	All components of the workbook are fully developed and readily available.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
8.	Workbook performance is highly reliable.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
9.	The workbook is easy to maintain and up-grade.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
10.	Acquisition costs for the workbook are quite reasonable. . .	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
11.	Operational costs—e.g. costs for paper, energy, & supplies for work book use are low.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
12.	Renewal costs—e.g. replacement & upgrade costs are minimal.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]

COPIED AT STATE EXPENSE

If you coded any responses in the darkened area please use this page to explain your response. In other words, if you do not agree with the statement please tell us

A. what has happended to cause you to 'disagree?'

B. who or what organizational unit can resolve the problem.

C. what can be done to change future entries to 'agree?'

For example, two potential descriptions for a disagree code for question 2 are

1. I disagree because workers are finding that the workbook is very difficult to use in sex abuse cases. I have been unable to help them. To resolve this problem the Project Director needs to reevaluate training and/or the usefulness of the workbook in sex abuse cases.

2. I disagree because late delivery of blank workbooks has caused use of old forms. The regional office takes 2 to 3 weeks to meet requests for blank workbooks. Workers are having problems switching back to the workbook. Project Director needs to do refresher training. The branch could distribute workbook directly to the pilot units or unit supervisors could over-order and maintain large stocks of workbooks.

II. USER AND SETTING FACTORS

The success of an innovation is linked to characteristics of the setting and the users as well as characteristics of the innovation. The twelve setting characteristics listed below are often linked with successful projects. AT THIS POINT IN TIME, HOW ACCURATELY DO THESE STATEMENTS DESCRIBE THE CASE INVESTIGATION PROJECT?

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking the appropriate number on the seven.point scale.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	Staff are aware of expected benefits, cost, & procedures for using the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
2.	Staff have skills & knowledge needed to complete & use the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
3.	Personnel turnover is low enough that it will be easy to retain experienced workbook users.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
4.	Staff perceive the need for using the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
5.	Staff are highly motivated to give the workbook a fair trial.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
6.	Staff's beliefs & values make it easy for them to accept the workbook as legitimate practice.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
7.	Current job descriptions are adequate to cover use, supervision, & other required roles.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
8.	Facilities, equipment, & funds are available to support use of the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
9.	Current bookkeeping, personnel, budget, & resupply procedures accommodate demands of the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
10.	Leaders at all levels strongly endorse the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
11.	Rules are in place to guide use, security, & accountability for the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
12.	I can identify and address factors that hinder proper use of the workbook in my unit. . . .	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]

COPIED AT STATE EXPENSE

If you coded any responses in the darkened area please use this page to explain your response. In other words, if you do not agree with the statement please tell us

A. what has happended to cause you to 'disagree?'

B. who or what organizational unit can resolve the problem.

C. what can be done to change future entries to 'agree?'

For example, two potential descriptions for a disagree code for question 2 are

1. I disagree because the regional office takes 2 to 3 weeks to meet requests for blank workbooks. The branch could resolve the problem by distributing workbooks directly to the pilot units. Also, unit supervisors could resolve the problem by over-ordering and maintain large stocks of workbooks.

2. I disagree because it requires a lot of unit time to foreward copies and original of various items to the Project Director. The Project Director could resolve the problem by allowing us to copy materials needed at the unit and foreward all original forms to him.

APPENDIX C

CPS Automated Systems

FLOW OF CPS AUTOMATED SYSTEMS



APPENDIX D

RIF/RAF Model

FEATURES OF THE SYSTEM: DECISION MODEL

.SYSTEM IS CONSTRUCTED TO REFLECT DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

.WHAT IS THE CASE DECISION?
- .CLOSE
- .OPEN: IN-HOME
- .OPEN: REMOVE

.CASE DECISION BASED UPON ASSESSMENT OF RISK INTENSITY AND OF RESOURCE AVAILABILITY





APPENDIX E

Material Used in Developing the Conceptual Design

FLOW OF CPS
AUTOMATED SYSTEMS



PROJECT OBJECTIVES

- ORIGINAL OBJECTIVES
  - PROVIDE METHODS TO IMPROVE THE CONSISTENCY AND ACCURACY OF DECISIONS DETERMINING THE EXISTENCE OF ABUSE OR NEGLECT AND ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES;
  - PROVIDE METHODS TO IMPROVE THE ASSESSMENT OF NEED FOR CONTINUED SERVICES TO REMEDY PROBLEMS CONTRIBUTING TO CHILD ABUSE OR NEGLECT.

- THESE OBJECTIVES WILL BE ACHIEVED THROUGH:
  - FOCUSING THE INVESTIGATION ON THE IDENTIFICATION AND RECORDING OF INFORMATION THAT IS PERTINENT TO THE DECISION TO OPEN OR CLOSE A CASE FOR SERVICES;
  - PROVIDING THE WORKER AND SUPERVISOR WITH INFORMATION THAT WILL ASSIST THEM IN THE INTERPRETATION OF DATA COLLECTED DURING THE INVESTIGATION;
  - REDUCING REPETITIVE RECORDING OF INFORMATION IN MULTIPLE FORMATS.

- PROJECT DELIVERABLES
  - PILOT OF AUTOMATED SYSTEM
    - Standardized data collection
    - Investigation decision support
  - MANUAL SYSTEM FOR NON-AUTOMATED SITES
  - PROJECT EVALUATION

- PROJECT DELIVERY DATE: FEBRUARY 28, 1986



MAJOR SYSTEM COMPONENTS

E-3

FEATURES OF SYSTEM: MAJOR COMPONENTS

- STANDARDIZED DATA COLLECTION
  - MANUAL INVESTIGATION WORKBOOK
    - Standalone capability
    - Automated input document
  - AUTOMATED DATA COLLECTION SCREENS
    - Same design as workbook
    - Optional entry by worker
  - CANRIS, CLIENT OUTCOME ASSESSMENT

- DECISION SUPPORT
  - DECISION SEQUENCE
    - Worker must complete
    - Information display
    - Factor weighting
  - RISK ASSESSMENT
    - Automated recognition of risk profiles
    - Worker alerted to risk conditions
  - CASE DECISION SUPPORT
    - Mathematical decision model
    - Worker informed of how case compares to similar cases

- MANAGEMENT SUPPORT
  - PROVIDES FOR TRACKING OF INVESTIGATION PROCESS
  - MANAGEMENT REPORTING
  - SERVICE CONTROL COMPLIANCE

- INFORMATION SUPPORT
  - GUIDE FOR INVESTIGATION ACTIONS AND DECISIONS
  - "EXPERT" INFORMATION
    - Policy
    - Staff Development training material
    - Professional literature

APPENDIX F

Case Investigation Decision Support System
Status Report on Automated CIDSS

CIDSS PILOT STATUS REPORT

Problems in using CIDSS Software

1. Currently the Case Directory serves as a useful tool for case identification and tracking the case status, but it does not contain all the information needed by the workers and managers for managing the investigation workload.

The result of this is that there is little incentive for the unit supervisor to keep information current on the Case Directory, and it tends to be perceived as an additional chore rather than as a management aid. In its current form the Case Directory does not replace the manual case log that supervisors use for the investigation caseload, although it does replace the manual notification of the regional Masterfile of case assignment.

With the addition of certain information fields, the Case Directory will be able to replace more of the manual case tracking systems currently in use, including the monthly generation of worker, unit, program, and regional statistics needed to manage the program. This, in turn, will provide the incentive to staff to keep the information current on the system.

2. The procedures involved in updating information on the Case Directory are cumbersome and inefficient.

CIDSS was designed to keep the Case Directory information current as a by-product of the worker's documentation of the case, but at the pilot site only two of 10 units are using this approach. The other eight units are having to manage the Case Directory by using the CIDS software in a manner for which it was not designed, i.e., as primarily a Management Information System, and this is proving to be very unwieldy.

Our original pilot implementation design called for Automated Mapper Intake (AMI) to begin first, followed by use of CIDSS by only two investigation units. The impact of CIDSS was to be assessed after 30 days, and a decision made to expand its usage to other units or to modify it before taking this step. However, soon after AMI was implemented, it became apparent that all units receiving cases from the intake unit would have to use CIDSS in order to ensure that cases initiated on AMI were received by the appropriate unit and acted on in a timely manner.

This had a great impact on pilot site staff, since many of them had to begin using CIDSS without the fully adequate preparation. Because the case documentation process on CIDSS had as yet to be tested, and because of an insufficient number of terminals to support full implementation of CIDSS with ten units, the decision was made for CIDSS to be fully implemented in two units, with the other units using CIDSS only to manage the the Case Directory. This brought on another set of problems.

In order to use CIDSS simply as an MIS, the supervisor must first sign on to CIDSS, assign the case to the worker and then sign off. When the case is completed, the worker must sign on to CIDSS, update key information in the case, and sign off. The supervisor must then sign on to CIDSS again, update information on the case, and then sign off. This process is not conducive to efficient unit management.

Another difficulty inherent in using CIDSS in this manner is that certain functions which CIDSS restricts only to supervisors or to workers are often carried out and/or documented by unit secretaries. In fact it is the unit secretaries who are responsible for maintaining the current manual systems used for unit case management. Thus, in order to use CIDSS primarily as an MIS requires that the unit secretary use the supervisor's and the worker's authorization to keep Case Directory information current. This is extremely time-consuming and raises issues about MAPPER security.

The result of all this is that management of the Case Directory is perceived as more of a burden upon the unit than an aid, and no unit has been able to keep all Case Directory information updated.

3. There is no audit trail for cases transferred from one unit to another.

When a case is transferred from one unit to another, there is no way for the receiving unit to know the origin of the case or when it was transferred. It appears in the receiving unit's Case Directory as a new case, but it does not necessarily appear at the bottom of the Directory, as cases transferred from the Intake Unit do. This has caused confusion among the units, and at times it has resulted in some cases not being recognized and acted upon in a timely manner.

4. Entry of case information on the case by the worker or unit clerk has not been fully tested at this point.

Some workers feel that it is too time-consuming for them to enter their own case information, while others feel that it works satisfactorily. The one unit clerk who is entering all cases into CIDSS feels she is able to enter the data as rapidly as she was able to do under the old system. The point, however, is that there has not been enough experience with data entry on CIDSS to form a conclusion about the value of this aspect of the system. The pilot site staff themselves do not want to disable this part of the pilot until more testing has been done.

5. There continue to be problems with the terminals "locking up."

This seems to be related to the printing process. At the Riverside office, when this problem became acute, it was alleviated by taking the COP print terminal off the DOPS and connecting it directly to the DCP. Other causes could be staff unfamiliarity with the software, lack of adequate user documentation, and/or inadequate problem resolution procedures.

6. Automated filing of CANRIS report is not yet ready for implementation.

Adding this capability to the system will increase the ability of CIDSS to streamline the paperwork aspects of the investigation. It will prevent the worker from having to fill out and call in the information on the 2202. It will also give us the opportunity to develop an efficient and effective way to automate this function for the field staff.

7. There is no current capability for adding subsequent intake reports to already open investigation cases.

On some cases, several referrals are received and sent to CIDSS on the same case. This appears in the Directory as if there are several cases, when in fact there is only one case with several referrals. The supervisors need the ability to attach to an already existing case subsequent referrals which do not warrant a separate investigation.

APPENDIX G

Questionnaires for Evaluation of
CIDSS Automated System

CASE INVESTIGATION
DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM

FINAL FEDERAL EVALUATION

CPS SPECIALIST QUESTIONNAIRE

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT, RESEARCH, AND EVALUATION

EVALUATION

OF THE

CASE INVESTIGATION DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Please read the following instructions carefully and then complete the questionnaire.

- Please read the questions carefully and be sure to answer every question. If you like, you may discuss items in the comment section. Add pages if necessary.
- We want to know your honest opinions. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire.
- The survey identification number on this page helps us monitor the questionnaire returns without placing your name on the questionnaire or in the computer files.
- Most of the questions ask that you mark one of several numbers that appear on a scale beside the item. You are to choose the one number that best matches the description of how you feel about the item.
- The scale descriptions are different in different parts of the questionnaire. So, be sure to read the special instructions that appear with each section.

THANK YOU!

_____

SURVEY ID
(1-4)

TWO COMPONENTS MAKE UP THE CASE DECISION PROJECT:

1. The Case Investigation Decision Support System (CIDSS) Workbook.
2. The Automated Case Investigation Decision Support System

FIRST WE WANT TO LEARN WHAT YOU THINK ABOUT THE CIDSS WORKBOOK.

I. THE CIDSS WORKBOOK

1. I have completed _____ investigation(s) using the CIDSS workbook (including investigations prior to this pilot test).

2. About how many weeks did it take for you to become familiar with the CIDSS workbook format?

   _____ weeks or _____ I am not familiar with it

3. About how many weeks did it take before you felt comfortable and proficient in using the CIDSS workbook?

   _____ weeks or _____ I am not proficient in using it

4. Overall, Do you think that the use of the CIDSS workbook is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

5. Do you think that the use of a standardized investigation guide, is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

6. Is the CIDSS workbook better or worse than the recording system it replaced?

MUCH WORSE	SOMEWHAT WORSE	ABOUT THE SAME	SOMEWHAT BETTER	MUCH BETTER
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

7. If it was entirely your choice would you continue to use the CIDSS workbook?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

II. AUTOMATED CIDSS

If you have not used the Automated System, STOP. Skip to the comments on page 6.

> THE AUTOMATED CASE INVESTIGATION DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM (CIDSS) IS THE SECOND COMPONENT OF THE CASE DECISION PROJECT. IN THIS SECTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE WE WANT TO LEARN ABOUT YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH THE AUTOMATED CASE INVESTIGATION DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM (Automated CIDSS).

1. I have completed _____ investigation(s) using the Automated CIDSS.

2. About how long did it take for you to become familiar with the Automated CIDSS format?

   _____ days or _____ I am not familiar with it.

3. About how many weeks did it take before you felt comfortable and proficient in using the automated CIDSS?

   _____ days or _____ I am not proficient in using it.

4. Overall, do you think that the use of the Automated CIDSS is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

5. Do you think that the use of an Automated system to support Case Investigation is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

6. Is the Automated CIDSS better or worse than the recording system it replaced?

MUCH WORSE	SOMEWHAT WORSE	ABOUT THE SAME	SOMEWHAT BETTER	MUCH BETTER
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

7. If it were entirely your choice, would you continue to use the automated CIDSS?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

8. We are interested in learning how use of the Automated CIDSS has changed your job and the work you do. A number of possible changes are listed below.
Please indicate your level-of agreement or disagreement with each statement by marking the appropriate numbered box on the seven point-scale.
NOTE: disagreeing with the statements means that the reverse of the statement is true.

THE USE OF CIDSS HAS:	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
A. Increased the freedom I have on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B. Improved the quality of work I produce.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C. Made it more difficult to meet deadlines.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
D. Improved the documentation in case records	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E. Made it difficult to do a good job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
F. Made my work more challenging	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
G. Made my work more frustrating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
H. Decreased the discretion I exercise on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I. Increased my ability to get work done	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J. Increased the amount of time needed to complete documentation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
K. Made it easier to keep up with my workload.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
L. Made my job more interesting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
M. Increased the amount of time available for making client/collateral contacts.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. We have heard many comments regarding pilot staff's expectations of and experience in using the automated CIDSSand the-workbook. We have summarized groups of these comments into general statements.
Please mark the number that best represents your reaction to the following general statements.
NOTE: <u>disagreeing</u> with the statement means that the <u>reverse of the statement is true</u>.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
The automated CIDSS makes it easier to meet program standards.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The automated CIDSS record focuses on information important to the case decision more than the previous method of case recording.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A automated case record is less clear than a record before the Pilot Test.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The automated CIDSS record gives a more complete picture of a case than the previous method of case recording.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The automated CIDSS is especially good for:							
Recording quickie cases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recording complex cases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recording typical cases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The automated CIDSS record makes it hard to really understand the case.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I enter investigation information on the automated CIDSS as I work the case.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I use the CIDSS workbook to keep a record as I do the investigation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I refer to the CIDSS workbook as I do the investigation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I have a good understanding of the investigation model (RIF-RAF) presented in CIDSS workbook Training.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. If it were entirely your choice, the computer responded quickly and was always available, would you continue to use the automated CIDSS?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

11. If the computer responded quickly, and was always available, would the automated CIDSS make it easier to meet program standards?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

III. TRAINING

1. How effective was the training you received to prepare you to use the

1a. CIDSS WORKBOOK

1. Worthless
2. Inadequate
3. Adequate
4. Good
5. Excellent
9. Did not receive training (explain below)

1b. AUTOMATED CIDSS

1. Worthless
2. Inadequate
3. Adequate
4. Good
5. Excellent
9. Did not receive training (explain below)

2. If you rated training as 3 or lower, what changes in the training would help to raise your rating to good or excellent?

COMMENTS

One of the most important uses of a pilot test is the opportunity for hindsight. Please list below some things you feel could have done better.

We are especially interested in:

1. What additional information, support or training would have been helpful?

2. How would you change the automated CIDSS? Why?

COMMENTS

3. Any other comments you have. Add pages if you need more space. When you have finished, please fold in half with return address showing and staple closed.

John Theiss
Research Design Specialist
Technical Resources Section
Research and Evaluation Division
State Office, Z32-E

CASE INVESTIGATION DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM

FINAL FEDERAL EVALUATION

CPS SUPERVISORS QUESTIONNAIRE

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT, RESEARCH, AND EVALUATION

SUPERVISORS' EVALUATION

OF THE

CASE INVESTIGATION DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Please read the following instructions carefully and then complete the questionnaire.

- Please read the questions carefully and be sure to answer every question. If you like, you may discuss items in the comment section. Add pages if necessary.
- We want to know your honest opinions. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire.
- The survey identification number on this page helps us monitor the questionnaire returns without placing your name on the questionnaire or in the computer files.
- Most of the questions ask that you mark one of several numbers that appear on a scale beside the item. You are to choose the one number that best matches the description of how you feel about the item.
- The scale descriptions are different in different parts of the questionnaire. So, be sure to read the special instructions that appear with each section.

THANK YOU!

SURVEY ID
(1-4)

TWO COMPONENTS MAKE UP THE CASE DECISION PROJECT:

1. The Case Investigation Decision Support System (CIDSS) Workbook.
2. The Automated Case Investigation Decision Support System

FIRST WE WANT TO LEARN WHAT YOU THINK ABOUT THE CIDSS WORKBOOK.

I. THE CIDSS WORKBOOK

1. I have reviewed and signed off on _____ investigation(s) completed using the CIDSS workbook (including investigations prior to this pilot test).

2. About how many weeks did it take for you to become familiar with the CIDSS workbook format?

   _____ weeks or _____ I am not familiar with it

3. About how many weeks did it take before you felt comfortable and proficient in using the CIDSS workbook?

   _____ weeks or _____ I am not proficient in using it

4. Overall, Do you think that the use of the CIDSS workbook is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

5. Do you think that the use of a standardized investigation guide, is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

6. Is the CIDSS workbook better or worse than the recording system it replaced?

MUCH WORSE	SOMEWHAT WORSE	ABOUT THE SAME	SOMEWHAT BETTER	MUCH BETTER
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

7. If it was entirely your choice would you continue to use the CIDSS workbook?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

II. AUTOMATED CIDSS

If you have not used the Automated System, STOP. Skip to page 7 question 2.

> THE AUTOMATED CASE INVESTIGATION DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM (CIDSS) IS THE SECOND COMPONENT OF THE CASE DECISION PROJECT. IN THIS SECTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE WE WANT TO LEARN ABOUT YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH THE AUTOMATED CASE INVESTIGATION DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM (Automated CIDSS).

1. I have reviewd and signed off on _____ investigation(s) completed using the Automated CIDSS.

2. About how long did it take for you to become familiar with the Automated CIDSS format?

   _____ days or _____ I am not familiar with it.

3. About how many weeks did it take before you felt comfortable and proficient in using the automated CIDSS?

   _____ days or _____ I am not proficient in using it.

4. Overall, do you think that the use of the Automated CIDSS is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

5. Do you think that the use of an Automated system to support Case Investigation is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

6. Is the Automated CIDSS better or worse than the recording system it replaced?

MUCH WORSE	SOMEWHAT WORSE	ABOUT THE SAME	SOMEWHAT BETTER	MUCH BETTER
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

7. If it were entirely your choice, would you continue to use the automated CIDSS?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

8. We are interested in learning how use of the Automated CIDSS has changed your job and the work you do. A number of possible changes are listed below.
Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by marking the appropriate numbered box on the seven point-scale.
NOTE: disagreeing with the statements means that the reverse of the statement is true.

THE USE OF CIDSS HAS:	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISSOMEWHAT AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
A. Increased the freedom I have on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B. Improved the quality of work I produce.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C. Made it more difficult to meet deadlines.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
D. Improved the documentation in case records	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E. Made it difficult to do a good job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
F. Made my work more challenging	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
G. Made my work more frustrating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
H. Decreased the discretion I exercise on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I. Increased my ability to get work done	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J. Increased the amount of time needed to complete documentation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
K. Made it easier to keep up with my workload.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
L. Made my job more interesting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
M. Increased the amount of time available for making client/collateral contacts.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. We have heard many comments regarding pilot staff's expectations of and experience in using the automated CIDSSand the workbook. We have summarized groups of these comments into general statements.
Please mark the number that best represents your reaction to the following general statements.
NOTE: <u>disagreeing</u> with the statement means that the <u>reverse of the statement is true</u>.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
The automated CIDSS makes it easier to meet program standards.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The automated CIDSS record focuses on information important to the case decision more than the previous method of case recording.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A automated case record is less clear than a record before the Pilot Test.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The automated CIDSS record gives a more complete picture of a case than the previous method of case recording.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The automated CIDSS is especially good for:							
Recording quickie cases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recording complex cases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recording typical cases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The automated CIDSS record makes it hard to really understand the case.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I enter investigation information on the automated CIDSS as I work the case.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I use the CIDSS workbook to keep a record as I do the investigation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I refer to the CIDSS workbook as I do the investigation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I have a good understanding of the investigation model (RIF-RAF) presented in CIDSS Workbook Training.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. If it were entirely your choice, the computer responded quickly and was always available, would you continue to use the automated CIDSS?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

11. If the computer responded quickly, and was always available, would the automated CIDSS make it easier to meet program standards?

DEFINITELY NO	PROBABLY NO	NOT SURE	PROBABLY YES	DEFINITELY YES
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

III. TRAINING

1. How effective was the training you received to prepare you to use the

1a. CIDSS WORKBOOK

1. Worthless
2. Inadequate
3. Adequate
4. Good
5. Excellent
9. Did not receive training (explain below)

1b. AUTOMATED CIDSS

1. Worthless
2. Inadequate
3. Adequate
4. Good
5. Excellent
9. Did not receive training (explain below)

2. If you rated training as 3 or lower, what changes in the training would help to raise your rating to good or excellent?

WE ARE CONCERNED ABOUT HOW THE AUTOMATED SYSTEM AFFECTS HOW YOU DO YOUR JOB. WE ARE PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN THE FOLLOWING THREE AREAS. PLEASE MARK A CODED RESPONSE TO EACH OF THE QUESTIONS AND PLACE YOUR WRITTEN DESCRIPTION IN THE SPACE PROVIDED, AND ON ADDITIONAL PAGES IF YOU NEED THEM.

IV. SUPERVISOR QUESTIONS

1. The automated CIDSS has case assignment and tracking capability built into it. Please mark your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements concerning the CIDSs managmenet features of case assignment and tracking. NOTE: disagreeing with the statement means that the reverse of the statement is true.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
The automated CIDSS makes it easier for me to track CPS specialists workload.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The automated CIDSS makes it easier for me to make case assignments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The automated CIDSS makes it easier for me to spot potential problems in meeting deadlines.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The automated CIDSS makes it easier for me to review cases currently being investigated.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The automated CIDSS makes it easier for me to identify shortcomings in quality of case recording.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The automated CIDSS makes it easier for me to identify shortcomings in quality of investigations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. When you have to consult with a CPS specialist concerning a case they are investigating, or have investigated, the CIDSS record makes it harder or easier to:

	MUCH HARDER	SOMEWHAT HARDER	ABOUT THE SAME	SOMEWHAT EASIER	MUCH EASIER
Identify the major or important aspects of the case.	1	2	3	4	5
Why?					
Discuss the case with the investigator	1	2	3	4	5
Why?					
Communicate your concerns to the investigator	1	2	3	4	5
Why?					

3. IF YOU HAVE A CPS SPECIALIST WHO'S ONLY EXPERIENCE WITH CASE INVESTIGATION RECORDING IS THE CIDSS SYSTEM:

Did the CIDSS make it harder or easier for you to train the specialist?

Harder Easier

[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

Why?

Did the CIDSS make it harder or easier for you to supervise the specialist?

Harder Easier

[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

Why?

COMMENTS

One of the most important uses of a pilot test is the opportunity for hindsight. Please list below some things you feel could have been done better.

We are especially interested in:

1. What additional information, support or training would have been helpful?

2. How would you change the automated CIDSS? Why?

COMMENTS

3. Any other comments you have. Add pages if you need more space. When you have finished, please fold in half with return address showing and staple closed.

John Theiss
Research Design Specialist
Technical Resources Section
Research and Evaluation Division
State Office, 232-E

CASE INVESTIGATION DECISION

SUPPORT SYSTEM

TRAINING EVALUATION

MARCH 1986

OFFICE OF RESEARCH

DEMONSTRATION AND EVALUATION

TRAINING EVALUATION

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

- Please answer every question. If you like, you may discuss the training, the workbook, or training evaluation questions in the comment section.

- We want to know your honest opinions. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire.

- **The identification number** on this page helps us monitor the returns without placing your name on the evaluation or in the computer files.

THANK YOU!

-- -- -- --

I TRAINING FEEDBACK SECTION

1. **The instructor demonstrated a genuine interest in this material.**

   [1] DEFINITELY YES
   [2] YES
   [3] NOT SURE
   [4] NO
   [5] DEFINITELY NO

2. **The instructor presented the material coherently, emphasizing major points and making relationships clear.**

   [1] DEFINITELY YES
   [2] YES
   [3] NOT SURE
   [4] NO
   [5] DEFINITELY NO

3. **The training adequately prepared me to use the CIDSS workbook.**

   [1] DEFINITELY YES
   [2] YES
   [3] NOT SURE
   [4] NO
   [5] DEFINITELY NO

4. **What part(s) of the workshop will be most HELPFUL to you in doing your job?**

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. **What part(s) of the workshop will be LEAST helpful in doing your job?**

   _____

   _____

   _____

6. **What suggestions do you have for IMPROVING the training?**

   _____

   _____

II. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

At the beginning of the training, you expressed some opinions concerning your expectations about the **CIDSS** Workbook. The following questions will tell us how the training affected your expectations. Please check the number of the statement that best describes your opinions.

1. **The CIDSS Workbook is:**

   [1] MUCH BETTER THAN I EXPECTED

   [2] SOMEWHAT BETTER THAN I EXPECTED

   [3] ABOUT WHAT I EXPECTED

   [4] SOMEWHAT WORSE THAN I EXPECTED

   [5] MUCH WORSE THAN I EXPECTED

2. **Do you think that THIS workbook is a GOOD IDEA for Child Protective Services?**

   [1] DEFINITELY NO
   [2] PROBABLY NO
   [3] NOT SURE
   [4] PROBABLY YES
   [5] DEFINITELY YES

3. Now that you are familiar with the **CIDSS** Workbook, how do you think the workbook will change your job and the work you do? A number of possible changes are listed below. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking the appropriate number on the seven-point scale.

THE CIDSS WORKBOOK WILL:

1.	Increase my workload	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
2.	Increase the freedom I have on my job	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
3.	Improve the quality of work I produce	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
4.	Make it more difficult to meet deadlines	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
5.	Make it difficult to do a good job	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
6.	Make my work more challenging	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
7.	Make my work more frustrating	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
8.	Decrease the discretion I can exercise on my job.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
9.	Increase my ability to get work done	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
10.	Make it easier to keep up with my workload	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
11.	Make my job more interesting	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]

III. SPECIFIC CONCERNS

Please make at least one positive and one negative statement or observations about the idea of an investigation guide, the **CIDSS** workbook, and/or the way it is being implemented.

POSITIVE:

NEGATIVE:

IV. MATCHING THE MODEL AND THE WORKBOOK

The **CIDSS** system is based on the investigation model presented in the training. The workbook was planned to correspond to the model. Several major sections of the model and the workbook are listed below. Please put an 'X' in every box that represents a match between the model and the workbook.

WORKBOOK SECTIONS

Allegations

Evaluation of Children

Description of Injuries

Explanation of Allegation (adult)

Family Ability to Protect

Community Resources Used/Needed

Supervisor Review

MODEL

EVENT:
What happened

EXTENT:
How serious

DYNAMICS:
Environment

RESOURCE
Availability

V. USING THE CIDSS WORKBOOK

The two paragraphs below include information from an intake and an initial investigation contact. Please read this information and enter it in the appropriate places in the attached workbook.

> **On March 7, 1985** you were assigned the following Priority I abuse investigation. Pete S. arrived at school severely bruised with blackened eyes and a bloody ear. The school nurse alleges that Mr. Riser abused Pete. The intake report contained Mr. Riser's work phone number. You immediately called him.
>
> Mr. Riser reported that he was only trying to teach his step-son, Pete, the importance of success in academic and sports activities. He said that he expects his son to excel in everything and punishes him severely when he does not. He repeatedly emphasized that he did not hit Pete and therefore does not abuse him.

Beginning with the ALLEGATIONS section, please enter this initial investigation information in the workbook.

This completes the training evaluation, we would appreciate any additional comments on the training and/or the workbook. Please write them in the space below. When you have finished:

- o Fold the training evaluation in half with the return address showing.
- o Place you training evaluation form in the box by the door.

COMMENTS:

TO: JEFFREY M. ANDERSON
ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
MAIL CODE 503-E
STATE OFFICE

APPENDIX H

Implementation Factors Survey
for Evaluation of Automated CIDSS

CASE INVESTIGATION
DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM
WORKBOOK

CPS SPECIALIST'S ASSESSMENT
OF
IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS

Office of Strategic Management
Research and Development

MONITORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF

THE CASE INVESTIGATION DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- We want to know your honest opinions. Please do not write your name on the Implementation Factors Questionnaire.
- The survey identification number on this page helps us monitor the questionnaire returns without placing your name on the questionnaire or in the computer files.
- The questions ask you to circle one of several numbers that appear on a scale beside each statement. You are to choose the one number that best matches the description of how you feel about the statement.
- You may write comments in the Problem Explanation sections and in the comment section at the end of the questionnaire.

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING

_____

ID

I. INNOVATION FACTORS

Numerous factors affect the success of an innovation. The ten factors listed below are often linked with successful projects. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling the appropriate number on the seven point scale.

AT THIS POINT IN TIME, HOW ACCURATELY DO THESE STATEMENTS DESCRIBE THE CASE INVESTIGATION PROJECT?

	AGREE STRONGLY	AGREE	AGREE SOMEWHAT	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	DISAGREE	DISAGREE STRONGLY
1. The expected benefits for using the workbook are clear . . .	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
2. The procedures for using the workbook are clear.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
3. The procedures for getting, completing, using, and storing the workbook are simple.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
4. The workbook configuration is stable: content, format and procedures will not have to change much over time.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
5. There is need for the workbook in my unit.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
6. Beyond meeting the need, the workbook has obvious advantages for my unit.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
7. The effectiveness of the workbook is readily observable.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
8. All components of the workbook are fully developed and readily available.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
9. Using the workbook, I can complete investigations as fast or faster than without the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
10. The workbook is a reliable decision support tool.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]

PROBLEM EXPLANATION

If you coded any responses in the darkened area please use this page to explain your response. IF YOU DO NOT AGREE WITH A STATEMENT PLEASE TELL US:

A. what has happened to cause you to 'disagree?'

B. what can be done to change future entries to 'agree?'

C. who or what organizational unit can resolve the problem?

For example, a description for a disagree code for question 3:

#3. (A) It is not easy to get new forms. The masters provided by State Office are not clear enough form making good copies.
(B) New masters could be made and printed (in large quantities) at the State printshop in Austin.
(C) I think the project director should take care of this.

II. USER AND SETTING FACTORS

The success of an innovation is linked to characteristics of the setting and the users as well as characteristics of the innovation. The nine setting characteristics listed below are often linked with successful projects. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking the appropriate number on the seven point scale.

AT THIS POINT IN TIME, HOW ACCURATELY DO THESE STATEMENTS DESCRIBE THE CASE INVESTIGATION PROJECT?

		AGREE STRONGLY	AGREE	AGREE SOMEWHAT	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	DISAGREE	DISAGREE STRONGLY
1.	I am aware of the expected benefits from using the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
2.	I have skills & knowledge needed to use the workbook	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
3.	It will be easy to retain experienced workbook users in my unit.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
4.	I feel motivated to give the workbook a fair trial.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
5.	My beliefs and values make it easy for me to accept the workbook as legitimate practice.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
6.	Facilities, equipment, and supplies are available to support the use of the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
7.	Leaders at all levels endorse the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
8.	I can identify and address factors that hinder my use of the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
9.	Policies and Procedures are in place to guide the use & security of the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]

PROBLEM EXPLANATION

If you coded any responses in the darkened area please use this page to explain your response. IF YOU DO NOT AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT PLEASE TELL US:

A. what has happened to cause you to 'disagree?'

B. what can be done to change future entries to 'agree?'

C. who or what organizational unit can resolve the problem?

A potential description for a disagree code for question 3:

#3. (A) I am new to this unit. I did not receive the training (neither did three other CPS specialists).
(B) Follow-up training is needed, or an orientation to the workbook needs to occur during the first weeks with the unit.
(C) Either Staff Development or the Project Director could provide training/orientation.

This completes the questionnaire. We would appreciate any additional comments you would like to make. Please write them in the space below. When you have finished, please:

- **Fold the questionnaire in half** (so the return address is showing) and tape or staple the questionnaire shut.
- **Return the completed questionnaire** through agency mail.

Thank you very much for participating.

COMMENTS:

AGENCY MAIL

TO: JEFFREY M. ANDERSON
OFFICE OF STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT,
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
STATE OFFICE M.C. 231-E



CASE INVESTIGATION

DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM

WORKBOOK

CPS SUPERVISOR'S ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS

OFFICE OF RESEARCH

DEMONSTRATION AND EVALUATION

MONITORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF

THE CASE INVESTIGATION DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- We want to know your honest opinions. Please do not write your name on the Implementation Factors Questionnaire.
- The survey identification number on this page helps us monitor the questionnaire returns without placing your name on the questionnaire or in the computer files.
- The questions ask you to circle one of several numbers that appear on a scale beside each statement. You are to choose the one number that best matches the description of how you feel about the statement.
- You may write comments in the Problem Explanation sections and in the comment section at the end of the questionnaire.

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING

_____

ID

I. INNOVATION FACTORS

Numerous factors affect the success of an innovation. The ten factors listed below are often linked with successful projects. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling the appropriate number on the seven point scale.

AT THIS POINT IN TIME, HOW ACCURATELY DO THESE STATEMENTS DESCRIBE THE CASE INVESTIGATION PROJECT?

		AGREE STRONGLY	AGREE	AGREE SOMEWHAT	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	DISAGREE	DISAGREE STRONGLY
1.	The expected benefits for using the workbook are clear . . .	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
2.	The procedures for using the workbook are clear..	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
3.	The procedures for getting, completing, using, and storing the workbook are simple.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
4.	The workbook configuration is stable: content, format, and procedures will not have to change much over time.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
5.	There is need for the workbook in my unit.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
6.	Beyond meeting the need, the workbook has obvious advantages for my unit.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
7.	The effectiveness of the workbook is readily observable.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
8.	All components of the workbook are fully developed and readily available.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
9.	Using the workbook, my staff can complete investigations as fast or faster than without the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
10.	The workbook is a reliable decision support tool.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]

PROBLEM EXPLANATION

If you coded any responses in the darkened area please use this page to explain your response. IF YOU DO NOT AGREE WITH A STATEMENT PLEASE TELL US:

A. what has happened to cause you to 'disagree?'

B. what can be done to change future entries to 'agree?'

C. who or what organizational unit can resolve the problem?

For example, a description for a disagree code for question 3:

#3. (A) It is not easy to get new forms. The masters provided by State Office are not clear enough form making good copies.
(B) New masters could be made and printed (in large quantities) at the State printshop in Austin.
(C) I think the project director should take care of this.

II. USER AND SETTING FACTORS

The success of an innovation is linked to characteristics of the setting and the users as well as characteristics of the innovation. The nine setting characteristics listed below are often linked with successful projects. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking the appropriate number on the seven point scale.

AT THIS POINT IN TIME, HOW ACCURATELY DO THESE STATEMENTS DESCRIBE THE CASE INVESTIGATION PROJECT?

		AGREE STRONGLY	AGREE	AGREE SOMEWHAT	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	DISAGREE	DISAGREE STRONGLY
1.	Staff are aware of the expected benefits from using the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
2.	Staff have skills & knowledge needed to use the workbook	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
3.	It will be easy to retain experienced workbook users in my unit.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
4.	Staff perceive the need for using the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
5.	Staff are motivated to give the workbook a fair trial.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
6.	Staff's beliefs and values make it easy for them to accept the workbook as legitimate practice.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
7.	Facilities, equipment, and supplies are available to support the use of the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
8.	Leaders at all levels endorse the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
9.	Policies and Procedures are in place to guide the use & security of the workbook.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]

PROBLEM EXPLANATION

If you coded any responses in the darkened area please use this page to explain your response. IF YOU DO NOT AGREE WITH A STATEMENT PLEASE TELL US:

A. what has happened to cause you to 'disagree?'

B. what can be done to change future entries to 'agree?'

C. who or what organizational unit can resolve the problem?

A potential description for a disagree code for question 3:

#3. (A) I have three new CPS Specialists who did not receive the training.
(B) Follow-up training is needed, or an orientation to the workbook needs to occur during the first weeks with the unit.
(C) Either Staff Development or the Project Director could provide training/orientation.

This completes the questionnaire. We would appreciate any additional comments you would like to make. Please write them in the space below. When you have finished, please:

- **Fold the questionnaire in half** (so the return address is showing) and tape or staple the questionnaire shut.
- **Return the completed questionnaire** through agency mail.

Thank you very much for participating.

COMMENTS:

AGENCY MAIL

TO: JEFFREY M. ANDERSON
ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
MAIL CODE 503-E
AUSTIN, TEXAS

GLOSSARY

Automated MAPPER Intake (AMI) System--a mainframe computer application that replaced the Prompted Intake System. AMI allows for documentation of an intake report and electronic transfer of the intake report to another user, while simultaneously producing management information reports from the intake report data.

CIDSS--Case Investigation Decision Support System. Two-part product developed by the Case Decision Project. Part I is a printed workbook that leads CPS specialists through a standardized method of handling CPS cases. Part II, automated CIDSS, is a software version of the workbook. Data from the automated CIDSS can be aggregated and reported in ways that aid management of CPS and decisions on cases.

CPS Automation Plan--three-stage automation of DHS's child protective services, illustrated in figure I-1.

CPS specialists--caseworkers who specialize in child protective services.

DHS--Texas Department of Human Services.

DSS--Decision Support System; a computer system that takes information relevant to a certain decision-making process, analyzes the information, and configures it in ways that allow the decision to be made more quickly and/or more accurately.

Innovation Factors--Innate characteristics of an innovation that affect its acceptance.

MAPPER--Maintaining, Preparing, and Producing Executive Reports; a computer language.

MIS--Management Information System; a computer system in which information needed for management of a task or operation is collected and displayed for use by persons responsible for the completion and/or control of that task or operation.

Model Exercise--Post-training test of understanding the RIF/RAF Model.

Prompted Intake System--an application for microcomputers that assists the CPS intake worker in documenting an intake report. The system carries the user through a series of on-screen prompts to ensure that all relevant information is obtained. Replaced by Automated MAPPER Intake (AMI) System.

PSFC--Protective Services for Children Branch in DHS.

RIF/RAF Model--Risk Intensity Factors/Resource Availability Factors; a conceptual model of the decision process in CPS cases.

User and Setting Factors--factors outside an innovation itself that influence its acceptance.

Workbook--see CIDSS.

Workbook Exercise--Post-training test of proficiency at using the CIDSS workbook.